OF THE AVTHOR AND SVBSTANCE OF THE PROTESTANT CHVRCH AND RELIGION,

TWO BOOKES.

Written first in Latin by R. S. Doctour of Diuinity,

AND

Now reuiewed by the Author, and translated into English by W. Baf.



Euery thing must be reduced to its beginning.

Tertull. Præscript. cap. 20.

Permissu Superiorum, M. DC. XXI.

XUM

The Scope of this Worke.

IF both Luther *himselfe, and the famousest Protestants of all sorts, haue many wayes most plainly and most freely confessed, that* Luther *was the* Author *and* Beginner *of the* Protestant Church *and* Religion (*as in this worke doth manifestly appeare*) *then vndoubtedly he was so.*

And if Luther *were the* Author *and* Beginner *therof, assuredly, it is not the* Church *and* Religion *of Christ.*

Read therefore and iudge indifferently; and thereby an end may be made of all Controuersies in Religion *betwixt the* Catholiks *and* Protestants.

LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY
NEW YORK

THE

THE PREFACE OF THE AVTHOR TO the Reader.

Wherein the manner and profit of this Worke is declared.

THERE are two kinds of questions (gentle Reader) which are in controuersy betwixt the Catholikes and Protestantes; the one kind is of fact, to wit, *Whether Luther was the Author, and beginner of the Protestants Church and Religiõ; whether before him it were visible and had Pastours; whether he and the first Protestant Preachers were sent to preach Protestancy, and the like:* The other kind of question is of Christs doctrine or law: For example, *whether Christ taught good workes do iustify, be necessary to saluation, meritorious, and*

Why a question of Fact is handled rather then of doctrin

such others. At this present I treate not of this second kind of question, but only of the former and that for three causes. First the questions of Doctrine are innumerable, but the questions of Fact, few. And many haue handled them, and that most exactly, but these, few haue touched, and (for ought that I know) none of purpose hath hitherto written of the Authour of Protestancy, and in that manner as I intend to write.

1. Secondly there are few questions of doctrine of that nature, that all other controuersies of faith depend vpon them; but the most questions of Fact are such, as if they be well decided, al other Controuersies of religion are at an end. Such kind of question this especially is, which now I handle, *Whether Luther were Author and beginner of the Protestant church and Religion* For if it be made manifest, that he was the Author and Beginner of it, euery one will straihgt see that it is not Christs Church & Religion, but Luthers deuise and inuention.

2. Thirdly in questions of doctrine, or law, Protestants want not some pretext of Scripture (as neither any Heretikes wanted) and therfore diuers tymes they are ready to debate these kind of Questions, in which (as Tertullian sayth) *they pretend Scriptures, and with this their boldnes shake some, and in the dispute weary the constant, catch the weake, & send away the middl. sort with scruple and doubts*. But in questi-

3. Prescrip. c. 25.

ons

ons of Fact they are destitute not only of al pretence of Scripture, vnles it be some most vaine, but also of all testimony of men and help of reason, and stand only vpon their owne sayinges, & are conuinced by the testimonies of the whol world, and sometyme also by their owne confessions, and therefore are brought to debate these kind of questions no more willingly, then is a theefe to his tryall. Neither do they in these disputs either weary the constant, or catch the weake; but shew their owne weaknes and wilfullnes vnto all kind of men. And this is the cause why Ministers are so loath to dispute of the Chnrch, because the Church, being a company of men, includeth many questions of fact, as of antiquity, succession, continuance, visibility, mission, ordination of Pastours, and such like; in which points there is little colour, or shew on their part.

2. Fourthly, Protestants exact more difficult proofes in questions of doctrine, then they can demand in matters of Fact. For in matters of Fact, wherof the scripture speaketh nothing, they must be content with testimonies of men, against whome no iust exception can be made, or they must refuse all triall of these kind of questions. But in controuersies of doctrine, they account those only to be lawfull proofes, which are taken out of the scripture. Neither

doe theſe ſatiſfie them, vnleſſe they be plaine & (a) expreſſe, and (as they ſay) word (b) for word containe that which is in queſtion, or at leaſt be ſo pregnant and ſtrong, that they (c) ſtopp all mens mouths that they can gainſay nothing. For it is the common fault of Proteſtants, which S. Auguſtin ſaith, himſelfe was guilty of, whiles he was an heretike, that they will be accetaine of all things as that ſeauen and three make ten. Nay they yield not alwayes to theſe kind of proofs: For what can be ſayd more expreſly, more plainly, more literally, then the ſcripture ſaith, that man is iuſtified by workes, and not only by faith; that, that which our Sauiour gaue with his hands to his Apoſtles after his laſt ſupper, was his very body and bloud, and ſuch like: & yet the Proteſtants yield not to theſe kind of teſtimonies, but deuiſe figures and ſhiftes to delude them. Catholiques proofes in controuerſies of doctrine are certainly Theological demonſtrations, becauſe they are clearly drawne from the proper principles of Diuinity, to wit, from cleare words of God confirmed by the tradition of the Church and vnanimous expoſition of the Fathers; which kind of proofe is as great and ſtrong, as either Diuinity or law, or any Science whatſoeuer which is founded in words either doth affoard, or the nature of any law or ſcience which is grounded in words (as

Diuinity

(a) Melan. & Brent. in Hoſpin. fol. 107. Colloq. Ratisb. ſeſſ. 2.

(b) Worſt. reſponſ. ad Blad.

(c) Luth. de ſeru. arbitr. fol. 440. Lib. 6. confeſſ. c. 4.

Diuinity is) can beare or affoard. And as the Philosopher saith well, it were starck madnes to exact any other kind of proofes of any Profession, then the nature therof can affoard. But because heretiques expound what words soeuer as they list, and litle set by the authority of the Church or Fathers, and the vnlearned hardly perceaue what kind of proofe is a Theologicall demonstration, & such as Diuinity can affoard no greater, or which is the true sense of Gods word, or how great the authority of the Church and Fathers ought to be; therefore with them, Catholiks proofs in points of doctrin, albeit in truth they be Theological demonstrations, take litle effect. Wheras on the other side Catholique proofes in matter of Fact, are not only Theologicall, but also (that I may so speake) Mathematicall demonstrations, because they consist of one principle which is grounded not only vpon the foundations of Diuinity, to wit the word of God together with the expositiō of the Church and Fathers, but also is manifest by the light of reason: which kind of principles these are, *That Gods Church hath alwayes bin: that it is one: that it is the auncientest of all Churches: that it is alwayes visible: hath alwayes Pastors*, and the like: And of another principle, which may be tryed by our sense and experience, as that the foresayd properties agree neither to the Protes- 1. Eth. 2.

tants nor to the Anabaptists, nor to any hereticall company. And therfore these kind of demonstrations mone euen the most obstinate heretiques, and are euident euen to the most ignorant and vnlearned persons.

3. And hence ariseth a fift cause of handling rather questions of Fact thenof doctrin, because the fruit of debating those questions is reaped with more facility and of far more. For wheras few but diuines do themselues perceaue the true meaning of the testimonyes of Scripture wherwith the questions of doctrin are debated; as the true meaning of the law, few but lawyers thēselues do see; all perceaue the meaning of those testimonyes wherwith the questions of fact are disputed, who will affoard an attētiue eye to see, or eare to heare. And heerupō Casaubon wrote, *that for to insinuate into the mind of the Reader any opinion now in controuersie, Baronius historyes are of greater force, then Bellarmines disputes*. And sayd also sometyme, as one most worthy of credit, who heard him, told me, that whiles he read Bellarmines disputations, he began to doubt of all Religion, but whiles he perused Baronius Annales, he felt himselfe by little & little drawn towards Papistry: which thing might wel haue befallen him and such others, not because Cardinall Bellarmine proueth lesse soundly, for the nature of the matter, the truth of Catholik Religion

Epist. dedicat. exercit. cont. Baron.

D. Flaminio.

ligion in queſtions of doctrine, then Cardinall Baronius doth the ſame in queſtions of Fact, but becauſe ſuch is the nature of the teſtimonyes, wherewith the truth of Catholike fayth in queſtions of doctrine is proued, that they are leſſe euident then the teſtimonyes wherewith the Catholike truth in matters of Fact is proued, and alſo haue many thinges which ſeeme to be contrary and repugnant to them. Whereupon it falleth out that ſome hearing or reading controuerſies of doctrine diſputed between Catholikes and Heretikes, and not being able of thē-ſelues to diſcern betwixt truth & ſhew of truth, either follow neither party, but become vncertaine or Atheiſtes, or content with any ſhew of truth take that part to which any affection of their will doth draw them. Whereas none by hearing or reading controuerſies of Fact, becommeth not more confirmed in the Catholik faith or more auerted from hereſy. And therefore Tertullian counſaileth vs, not to diſpute with Heretikes out of Scripture, by which queſtions of doctrine are diſputed, but aduiſeth vs to appeale to antiquity, ſucceſſion, and ſuch like which concerne queſtions of fact. *Præſcrip. cap. 19.*

4. Laſtly, though the fruit of diſputing both thoſe kind of queſtions were equall, yet ſith the Author, by order of nature, goeth before the thing whereof he is Authour, according to

the order of Nature we ought to intreate of the Author of Protestancy before we dispute of Protestancy it selfe. For (as well sayth Tertul-
Lib 5. cont Mar. lian) *nothing but God alone is without beginning which how much it goeth before in the state of all*
Lib 3 cont Mar. *thinges, so much ought it to go before in the handling of them, that the state may be knowne.* And other where: *Nothing is knowne before the beginning is knowne.* Wherfore I will begin my first dispute concerning the Protestant Religion of the Authour therof. Yet before I do that, I must set downe and determine what a Protestant, or the Protestant Church and Religion is, and what is necessary for one to be a Protestant, and discouer the vncertainty of Protestants. And this much touching the matter which I haue made choice of to handle in this little worke and the causes thereof.

VVhy proued only out of Protestants. 5. As for the manner wherwith I vndertake to discusse this question of Fact, whether Luther was the first Author & beginner of the Protestant Church, and Religion, I purpose to proue it only out of the confessions of Luther himselfe, and of the three sorts of Protestants, to wit, Lutherans, who professe to follow Luther in all points of doctrine; Sacramentaries, who notoriously dissent from him touching the reall presence of Christs body in the Sacrament; and our English Protestants, who differ from both

both the former at leaſt in diſcipline & gouer-
ment of their Church: becauſe this kind of
proofe out of their owne wordes I find to be
both neceſſary and moſt effectuall with Prote-
ſtants. Neceſſary, becauſe of this queſtion
of Fact, neither the Scripture, or the Fathers
ſay any thing, as alſo, becauſe, ſeeing Pro-
teſtants deny part of the ſcripture, and in-
terprete the reſt as they pleaſe, and will not
ſtand to the ſentence of the Church, Councels,
or Fathers, account reaſon Sophiſtrie, & con-
temme the teſtimonies of Catholique writers,
they haue left nothing but their own cõfeſſiõs,
by which we may diſpute with them. And I
pray God they do giue place to their own moſt
frequent and moſt plaine confeſſions, and not
delude them by voluntary and friuolous inter-
pretations; for then hope may be, that there
wilbe ſome end of theſe controuerſies. At leaſt
we ſhall reape this profit by this labour, that
by it ſhall be manifeſt to all, that either Proteſ-
tants will heare no teſtimony, admit no iudge-
ment, no not their owne, which is a moſt eui-
dent argument of a moſt deſperat cauſe; or that
they ſhall be condemned by their owne verdict
& ſentence; or laſtly that there can be no forme
of ſpeech ſo plaine, no words ſo cleare, no ſen-
tence ſo manifeſt, which they with their faig-
ned figures & deuiſes will not wreſt, fruſtrate,

neceſſary.

and

and delude; which is in effect to disanull al kind of proofe which is taken out of words or testimonies whatsoeuer. For I will bring so plaine testimonies of theirs, as plaine can scarce or not at all be deuised; I will bring so many, as themselues will require no more; I will bring so weighty, as themselues will demaund none more weighty; I wil bring them also most freely and often iterated and repeated; lastly I will bring not only those which indirectly and by consequence proue that which I would, but those also, & that especially & oftenest, which directly testify that which they are brought to confirme. Wherfore either they will not delude these words of theirs, or they wil delude all wordes whatsoeuer; And either they will not refuse these their owne testimonies and confessions, or they will reiect all testimonies and iudgements whatsoeuer, which is in effect to confesse that their cause is most desperate and most worthy to be reiected and condemned of all.

Most effectuall.

By reaſō.

6. This māner also of proofe is most effectuall, for what can be of greater force to conuince a man, then his owne iudgement and acknowledgement of the truth? Surely vnlesse a man will professe himselfe to be en enemy of truth, and of the number of them who see good and follow bad, he must needs imbrace that truth

truth which himselfe confesseth. Experience also sheweth the same. For when our Saviour could neither by infinite miracles nor evident scriptures stop the mouthes of the Iewes, he so convinced them out of their owne words, that (as the Euangelist writeth) *they answeared him not a word nor from that day any durst aske him a question*. And the Donatists, when they made answeare to the Catholikes argumẽts taken out of scripture, were so intangled in their owne fact touching the Maximinists, as (sayth S. (d) Augustine) *they euer more stood dumbe at that*. And now we see, that Protestants are tongue-tied at no sort of bookes so much, as at those, which are composed of their owne testimonies. This manner of dealing vsed the holy Fathers against the Pagans, as is to bee seen in Clement, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, Augustin, and others; and against heretiques also, as appeareth in the sayd S. Augustin. S. Hierome, and others, most often, and the same they most highly commend. For thus writeth (e) S. Denis of Alexandria: *It helpeth me much, that I can disproue them out of their owne wordes*. S. (f) Gregorie Nazianzen; *It is the greatest cunning and wisdome of speach to bind* (the Aduersary) *with his owne wordes*. And (g) Tertullian, of Nouatian: *It is a strong kind of proofe, which is taken of the aduersary*

By experience. Matt. 22.

(d) *In collat. 3. dieb. c. 22.*

By the Fathers.

(e) *In Euseb. l. 7. c. 8.*

(f) *Orat. de S. Basil.*

(g) *De Trinit. c. 30.*

XUM

nersary that truth may be proued euē by the enemyes of truth. S. (h) Ireneus: *We often disgrace them by their owne doctrine.* And (i) S. Augustine: *Neither will I bring against thee any other sentences for to shew the errour of Manichee, then out of thyne owne epistle:* Which worke of his he (k) preferreth before al the other which he wrote against that heresy. Nay, the same holy Fathers account this manner of dealing with heretiks necessary, and preferre it before all others. For thus sayth S. Ireneus (l) *It is needfull to disproue the Valentinians by their Mothers Fathers and Ancestours.* And in another (m) place: *That is a true and vnanswerable proofe which bringeth attestation frō the aduersaryes themselues.* And (n) Tertullian: *The aduersaryes testimony is eftsoones necessary.* Againe: *I must strike them with their own weapons.* And (o) S. Athanasius, who was most tryed in combates with heretikes: *Against wranglers we must oppose their owne arguments, in which* (sayth he) *I haue the greatest hope of victory.* S Chrysostome (p) also: *We must conuince them by this, when we turne their owne ill sayings against themselues, as often as we make those who were the famousest amongst them, their accusers.* And lastly (q) S. Augustine the most fortunate champion of the Church against heretiks seeing that the Donatists could be euidently conuinced by their owne dealing with the Maximinists, exhorteth

(h) Lib. 2. cap. 53.
(i) Lib. cont. Secund. c. 3.
(k) Lib. 2. Retract. c. 20.
(l) Lib. 1. cap. 35.
(m) Lib. 4. c. 14.
(n) Lib. de anima c. 3.
(o) Athan. l. de carne Christi.
(p) Hom. 3. in epist. ad Tit.
(q) Lib. 1. cont. Petil. c. 27.

horteth Catholikes to let alone all other kind of arguments, and still to vrge this only: *Remember* (sayth he) *this only fact of the Maximinists, cast this in their faces, answere to al obiections by the Maximinists alone.* And (r) againe: *I will not leaue this only fact which God hath put before their eyes to stop their mouthes, and to amend them if they be wise, or to confound them if they remayne obstinate.* And in like manner, when he saw, that the Donatists cause was quite ouerthrowne by that saying of theirs: *Neither one cause doth preiudice another, nor one person another*, he thus speaketh vnto Catholiques: (s) *I request you, I beseech you for Christs sake, that you remember it, speake it, and haue it euer in your mouthes. There could not be pronounced on our behalfe, a briefer, surer, and plainer sentence* Thus you see how greatly tho Fathers esteeme of this kind of dealing with heretikes, and how earnestly they vrge vs for to vse it.

(r) Ibid. cap. 18.

(s) Sermon. 23. de verb. Apostol.

7. And Protestants ought the more to allow this kind of proceeding with them, because they much commend it, and preferre it before all others. Luther: *There* (t) *is no stronger proofe, then his owne confession, who is accused, and his testimony against himselfe.* And againe: *No* (u) *man can conuince a lyer better then by his own words.* Hoshusius: *The* (x) *shortest way of al to conuince an aduersary is that which is taken out of his owne confession.*

(t) De seruo arbit. fol. 442.

(u) Tom. 1. Wit. fol. 449.

(x) Lib. de Cœna.

(y) Epist. Eucher.

(z) Loc. tis. de iudeis fol. 390.

(a) Survey c. 8. pag. 342.

(b) Cont. 202. c. 14.

(c) Praef. in Cant.

(d) Apol. 1. c. cap. 15.

Differences betwixt Protest. manner of dealing & ours.

fession, wherwith he openly acknowledgeth that which is obiected. Lucas (y) Osiander: *The confession and testimony of the aduersary is of greatest authority*. Peter (z) Martyr: *Surely amongst other testimonyes that is of greatest weight, which is giuen by the enemies*. D Bancroft: *Let* (a) *vs take hold of that which they haue graunted. You may be bold to build vpon it for a truth, that they are so constrayned to yield vnto*. D (b) Whitaker: *It must needs be a strong argument, which is taken out of the confession of the Aduersaryes. For the testimony of the aduersaryes is of force against themselues*. And (c) againe: *It is a notable matter and encreaseth much the triumph for to be proued by the testimony of the aduersaries*. And D Morton in the Epistle dedicatory of his answere to the Protestants Apology: *Which kind of assistance of learned aduersaryes the Apologists themselues haue layd down for the greatest reason of satisfaction, & we do accordingly admit*. Nay, they begin to vse this kind of arguing against vs, and vaunt much therof: *Who may not* (sayth the sayd. D. (d) Morton) *iustly congratulate the Protestants happines, whome truth it selfe proceeding out of their aduersaries mouths doth patronize?*

8. But, by their leaue, there are many and great differences betweene their and our kind of proceeding in this matter. First many of the Catholikes, whome they produce against vs, wrote

wrote before their Religion was risen, & therfore we answere that of them, which S. Hierom answered of the ancient Fathers, who liued before Arius appeared: *Before Arius* (sayth he) *arose in Alexandria like a noon-tide Diuell, they spake some things innocently and not so warily, which can-not escape the obloquie of certaine peruerse men.* And which S. Augustin answered of S. Chrysostom when the Pelagians alleadged his testimony. *Discoursing* (sayth he) *in the Catholike Church, he thought not that he was otherwise vnderstood. None was yet troubled with such a question; you not yet iangling, he spake more securely.* But the Protestats which we produce liued al after that protestancy was both bred and hatched, & after the Catholike fayth had for many ages shined through out the world, and therfore could not be ignorant what wordes of theirs might make for the Catholike fayth, and preiudice their owne cause. Another difference is, that none of the Catholikes whose testimonyes Protestants alleage against vs, is accounted of vs for a man sent extraordinarily of God, and much lesse for a Prophet, Euangelist, or Apostle. Nay, many of them are obscure writers, and of small or no reckoning among vs, some of them are not held for Catholikes of vs, and some of them euen by the iudgments of Protestants themselues are our open enemyes. But the confessions of fayth

Lib. 2. contr. Ruf. cap. 37.

Lib. 1. cont. Iul. ca. 6.

Cassander. Erasmus. Cornelius Agrippa. Marsil. of Padua. Beerus. Rhenanus. Faber. Saa. Pulcasius. Orthuinus Gratius.

which we cite against Protestats containe their faith, so that they cannot be reiected of them, vnles they will renounce their fayth. And of the men whose testimonyes we produce, one is accounted of them a (e) God, another a Prophet an (f) Euangelist, an Apostle, a third Elias, an Angell. His writings are held for inspired from heauen, for a rule of fayth, and equall to the writinges of the Apostles. Another is called a (g) great and admirable Prophet, others are esteemed for lights, lampes, bright starres, props, founders, parents, renewers of the Protestants church and religion. Others are men extraordinarily sent and diuinely raised to lighten the world; most of them for very learned, famous & well deseruing of the Protestant religion; & finally all for sincere Protestants. The holy Fathers were wont to refute both the (h) Pagans superstition and the (i) heretikes errours out of the Diuels confessions. Of which kind of proof (k) Tertullian, vsing it, maketh this account: *What more manifest then this fact? what more sure then this proofe? Believe them, they speake true of themselues, who vse to credit them when they lye. No man lyeth to his owne disgrace.* And S. (l) Cyprian: *Who so sayest that thou worshipest the Gods believe euen them whom thou worshippest.* And likewise Minutius in Octauio: *Neither do they lye to their owne shame, especially if some of you be by. Believe*

(e) Humf. ad Rat. 4. Camp.
(f) Colloq. Heidelbur. Schusselb. Catal. 13. Huius præfat. de liber. arbit.
(g) Sanct. lib. 4. de Eccles. c. 9. Beza ep. 6.
(h) Iustin. dial. cum Tryphon. Augustl. de ciuit. Chrysost. hom. 26. in 2. Cor. Cyril. l. 6. in Iulian.
(i) Hier. cont. Vigilant. Ambros. serm. 3. de Sanctis. Hilar. l. 1. & 6. de Trinit.
(k) Apol. cap. 22.
(l) Lib. ad Demetr.

liue themselues witnessing that they are Diuels, and confessing the truth of themselues. But our proofe taken out of the Protestants confessions of faith & out of Luther & such like famous Protestants testimony against Protestancy; is much more euident and stronger; both because it is more likely that men will confesse the truth, though against themselues, then the Diuell the father of lyes and sworne enemy of truth; as also because the confessions of the Diuel were extorted from him by force, as the Fathers themselues doe acknowledge, but these of Luther and his mates come most freely from them. Beliene therefore (O Protestants) your chiefe leaders, your founders, Instructors Prophets, Euāgelists, & Apostles, in that which they freely & of their own accord cōfesse of themselues & of their doctrine. Euen by the testimony of your own Prophets & teachers beliene, that Protestācy is newly risen, first founded by Luther, & before knowne to none. No man willingly lyeth to his owne shame; no man freely confesseth that which ouerthroweth his owne cause, but which he cannot deny. No man knew protestancy better then they, no man fauoured it more then they: *who* (sayth Caluin) *is to be credited touching Popery, more then the Pope himselfe?* And whom shal we beliene touching the author and hatching of protestancy amongst the Lutherans, rather then

Note.

De ver. Eccles. re. form.

Luther himselfe, Melanchon, the Century-writers, Kemnice, Schusselburg, and the like? Or amongst the Sacramentaryes, rather then Zuinglius, Bullinger, Bucer, Peter Martyr, Caluin, Beza, Plessie, and such others? or amongst English Protestants rather then Iewell, Fox, Whitaker, Fulke, Humfrey, Perkins, and the like, whose frequent and plaine confessions we heerin produce. A third difference betweene our and the Protestants manner of proceeding in this kind of proofe is, that Protestantes oftentymes alleadge Catholikes testimonyes corrupted, mangled, and falsifyed; and sometymes also the obiections which they make against theselues, insteed of their answeres, as Cardinall Peron not long since shewed Plessie to haue don before the French King, euen by the iudgment of Protestant themselues. And it were easy to demonstrate that D. (m) Morton hath done the like in his Apology. But I produce the testimonyes of Protestants certaine and entiere, at least for that sense for which I alleadge them. For I haue cited none in this worke which either I haue not seene with myne owne eyes, and for the most part haue quoted not only the bookes and chapters but also the leaues and pages, or if I haue wanted the booke, I haue cited them out of some good Author. The fourth difference & that of great moment is, that the Catholiques

conference at fountaine Bel-eaue.

(m) *Apol. part. 1. l. 1. c. 23. l. 2. c. 41. part. 2. l. c. 35. l. 2. c. 41.*

whos

whose testimonyes Protestants alleadge against is (if so be they were true Catholikes) were alwayes ready to reuoke and recall whatsoeuer they had written contrary to the catholik fayth, & to submit all their wordes or writings to the censure of the catholike Church, which to be the mind & disposition of all Catholiks, Protestants themselues confesse. For thus writeth D. (n) Whitaker: *This is the condition, this the consent of the Popish Church, that all hang their saluation vpon one man, and submit themselues to one mans iudgment.* And D. (o) Morton: *Is there any Papist that thinkes any decree of the Pope can be contemned or broken without cryme or heresy?* Which sith it is so, in yaine do they obiect any Catholikes words against the Catholike fayth. For either they are not contrary thereto, or if they be, they are already reuoked, recalled and disanulled by himselfe. But the mind and proceeding of Protestats is far otherwise, who subiect not their opinions to the iudgment of the Church, but as they thinke that she may erre, so will they hold their opinions notwithstanding her sentence to the contrary; and therfore iustly maywe produce their testimonies against their owne Church.

(n) Contr. 2. q. 5. c. 8.

(o) Apol. part. 1. l. 1. cap. 31.

9. The fift difference, & which is much to be noted, is, that Protestants alleadge Catholik witnesses in matters of doctrin, in which some

August. l. 21. cont. Faust. c. 5.

times by reason of the obscurity of the matter a man may chance to erre & slip; or els in such matters of fact, as were in times or places far distant from them, so that themselues could not search the truth, but beleeued the reports of others. Such a question is that of Pope *Ioane*, in which Protestants cite no Catholike author which liued not some ages after that time, wherin Pope *Ioan* is sayd to haue beene. Or if they produce any Catholike Author in any matter of fact, the truth whereof he might haue tried, either he is of no credit, or the matter is such, as it turneth to no preiudice of the Catholike faith. But we heer produce Protestants in a matter of fact, & such a matter as they could most easily know. For what was more easy, then for Luther and his followes to try either then or euer since, whether, when he first began, there was in the world any Protestant company, whether it were visible, whether it had Pastours, and the like? For who can thinke, that only the Protestant company could lye so close hid, that neither in all Luthers time or euer since, either he being, or the estate or condition, or place of Pastours, or any thing at all therof could be espied out of so many Arguses, which now in one whole age haue sifted all corners of the world to find it out? And besides, this is such a question of Fact, as vpon the decision therof

an end may be made of all cõtrouersies betweene Catholikes and Protestants. For (as I sayd before) if Luther be the Author and beginner of the Protestant Church, it is certaine, that it is not the Church of Christ, nor to be followed of Christians, but to be forsaken & detested. To which I ad now, that if Luther himself & such & so many learned & famous Protestãts as I haue cited, do by many wayes, & so plainly confesse, that Lutherwas the Author therof, it cannot be doubted, but that he was in truth the Author of it. For I alleadge not men of small credit among Protestants, but such as are of greatest authority with them; nor a few, but many; nor of one nation alone, but of diuers, to wit, Germans, Italians, French, English, Scottes, Flemings and others; nor Protestants of one sort or sect, but of all three namely Lutherans, Sacramẽtaries and English Protestants. So that they could not beare false witnesse in this matter either for wãt of knowledge, because they were many and learned & of different countries, and most diligent in searching the matter, and the matter it selfe most easy; nor for want of good will towards the cause, because they were all most earnest Protestants. And to refuse the testimonies of such witnesses in a matter of fact, in their owne time, so easy to be knowne, and so diligently

Note it

searched of them, what other thing is it, then obstinately to refuse to know the truth of this matter so important to be knowne, and whereby may be made an end of all contentions in Religion? Wherfore let Protestants say as they please, that in questions of doctrine they will not depend vpon Luther, Caluin, or any one, or all their doctours together, but vpon the scripture alone: Neuertheles in matter of fact, wherof the scripture saith nothing, such as this is (for the Scripture telleth not what was the state and condition of the Protestant Church when Luther began, in what place it was, what Pastours it had, who saw it, and the like) either they must confesse, that they refuse all triall & knowledge of so important a truth, or they must giue credit to the deposition of sufficient witnesses. And if euer men were or can be sufficiēt witnesses of any matter of Fact, Luther and those Protestants which here I produce, are sufficient witnesses of that which I bring them for to testify. And thus much touching the cause why I proue Luther to haue been the founder of Protestant Religiō only by the testimonies of Protestants.

Note.

Why so many Protestāts testimonyes are alleaged.

10. As for the reason why I alleadge so many Protestants, that is, that it may appeare, that it is not the priuate testimony of some one or few, but the generall consent of them all, or

at leaſt the common ſentence of many of them. And if I ſeeme to any Catholike ouer tedious in heaping vp ſo many teſtimonies of Proteſtants, I pray him to cõſider, that I write not this book to Catholikes to confirme them in the Catholike faith, who I know to that end doe not need the teſtimonies of Proteſtants; but that I write it partly to Catholikes, for to furniſh them with ſtore of Proteſtants teſtimonies to ſtopp their mouthes, and to ſhew them that they are right Heretikes, that is, condemned (as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh) by their owne iudgement, to which end a few teſtimonies of theirs would not ſuffice. And therfore to ſuch as intend this end the multitude of teſtimonies will not be troubleſome. For who, that indeauoureth vãquiſh moſt obſtinate enemies, will complain of the abundance of good ſoldiers wherof he may make choice? And if I had rehearſed only ſome few teſtimonies, and named the places where the reſt may be found, ſome would haue cauilled, as M. Iewel did againſt D. Harding, that I had cited dumbe witneſſes. Beſides, ſeing the iudgments of men are diuers, it may fall out, that what kind of teſtimonyes ſeem ſtrong & forcible to ſome, others acount but weake and litle to the purpoſe; and therfore it was behofull, that there ſhould be as it were a ſtore-houſe of Proteſtants teſtimonies, that euery one might

take what weapon he thinketh fittest for him, & vse it against them. But especially I gathered these testimonies of Protestants for the Protestants themselues, that by their owne mens iudgement I might withdraw them from their errour. And therfore I was not so fearfull to bring too many for Catholikes, as carefull to prouide inough for Protestants. In which I could hardly offend by multitude. For as S. (p) Vigil saith, *Mans mind possessed with the errour of a false opinion, is hard and slow to perceiue truth, with how many witnesses so euer it be vrged therto.* Or as (q) Tertullian writeth: *much talke in matter of edification is not foule if at any time it be foule.* And (r) S. Hierom: *delay is no losse, when by delay the victory is more assured.* Whereupon S. Augustin counsaileth vs, not to regard and delay whatsoeuer, so we bring good proofe of what we say. Besides, (s) Protestants deny that we ought to iudge of them by one or few; though they be Pastors, and (t) write that M. Brierly in his Protestants Apologie, although it be stuffed with all kind of Protestants testimonies, hath brought but a few testimonies. And as S. (u) Augustin saith of the Donatists, they *are ready to deny vvhat they can.* Or as S (y) Hierome speaketh: *Shutting their eyes deny vvhat they vvould vvere not.* For what could be more impudently denyed, then that which D. (z) Field denyeth

(p) Lib. 1. (q) Lib. de Patient. (r) Lib. 1. cons. Iou. (s) De gestis cum Emerit. (t) V. V bi. cons. 295. c. 17. l. 1. de script. c. 11. sect. Badel. in Refut. Posnan. c. 12. (u) White in defence of his way. c. 7. (x) Lib. 3. cont. Cres. c. 62. (y) Epist. ad Ctesiph. (z) Lib. 3. de Eccles. c. 6. & 42.

denieth that when Luther began, the publique and generall face of Religion in the Westerne Church was Papisticall? These men need haue their mouthes shut, and their eares stopt with multitude of testimonies. For as (a) Caluin saith *) it is the part of wicked & furious obstinate, to discredit so many and so authenticall testimonies.* Or as an (b) other sayth: *If in a matter of great importance one only witnes were alleadged, what place would his testimony find? But vnder so many and so great witnesses as are heere produced, all pretext of not receauing the truth is taken away. In so great certainty of so many witnesses, how is there so great loue of darknes, that they open not their eyes to see the light?* To which I add that saying of Varius in (c) Cicero: *Either these witnesses will suffice, or nothing will suffice.* Neuertheless, that I might both somewhat ease the wearines of Catholikes in reading so many testimonyes, and better set before the eyes of Protestants the force of their testimonyes, I doe for the most part marke in the margent those testimonyes which are most forcible, & after I haue recited them all, I gather the force and summe of them togeather which he may read, who loatheth to runne ouer so many.

(a) Instit. l. 1. c. 23. §. 3.

(b) Prosp. Syntag. conf.

(c) Lib. 2. de finibus.

Why many testimonyes of the same matter.

3. I bring also diuers testimonies of the same Protestants, especially of Luther, that it may appeare, that that confession slipt not from him

XUM

him vnawares and vnadui∫edly, but that it was his conſtant iudgement, if there can be any conſtancy in heretikes. For I remember that (d) Beza, for to couer Caluins foule contradictiõs of himſelfe, wrote; *As if of that vvhich one hath vvritten briefly in ſome place, it vvere to be gathered vvhat he thought of euery point of doctrine.* I graunt notwithſtanding, that I haue brought ſome teſtimonies which are not ſo cleare, as of themſelues they would conuince the matter; Yet ſuch they are as ſtrengthen thoſe that are cleare, and of them receiue light. For as in gathering an armie not only ſtout men but alſo ſome other are choſen, who may increaſe the ſtrength of thoſe that are ſtout, and likewiſe may be encouraged by them; ſo it fareth alſo in gathering teſtimonies. Neither yet did I gather all that occurred: but only ſuch as ſeemed more to the purpoſe. It will alſo delight the reader to ſee how ſome Proteſtants plainly and roundly confeſſe the truth, others deale more craftily & cloſely, and in them he ſhal eſpy that difference which S. Auſtin (e) noted between Celeſtius, and Pelagius, of whome he writeth, *that he vvas more ope, this more cloſe; he more obſtinate, this more falſe, he more free, this more wily*. If any aske how it fell out, that Proteſtats ſhould giue ſuch plain teſtimonies againſt their owne cauſe; I anſwere, that there were many cauſes heerof. Firſt the euidence

(d) *Præfat. epiſc. Cal.*

Lubertus præfat. defpas. P. V bi tak. ad Dionyſ. Areop. c. 1. Sanderi.

(e) *Lib. de peccat. origin. c. 22.*

uidence of truth, which maketh its enemies, yea (f) the deuils themselues sometimes to confesse it: *The very corners of lyes* (sayth (g) S. Basil) *oftentymes catcht with the euidence of truth, as with a snare, euen against their wills do witnes it.* Againe, *It is the nature of lyes to bewray themselues*, like (h) as Tertullian writeth: *Theeues commonly leaue some thing behind them, which bewrayeth them.* For as S. Augustine (i) sayth: *It is incredible, that he should not be taken by lyes, who lyeth to take others.* Or as S. Basil (k) hath: *So it is, that euill is not only contrary to good but also to it selfe.* And Luther (l) himselfe: *There is no heretike, who is not found of spirituall men to speak against himself in his lyes.* And els where: *This happeneth to the wicked, that by lying they cannot beware not to bewray themselues by their wordes. They lye some while and some tymes, but continually they cannot. At last lyes bewray themselues especially with them who marke and obserue. For there escapeth some word from them with which they are taken.* The same confesse (m) Caluin, (n) Beza, (o) Whitaker, and others. Another cause is, because Protestants (as heretiques are wont to do, and (p) themselues confesse that they practise it) accommodate their sayings and doctrine to time, place, and occasions, & therfore vtter those sayings which we here alleadge, before whome and when they thinck they will make to their purpose; but

(f) Lib. 2. cont. Eun.
(g) Lib. 3. cont. Eun.
(h) Tertul. de præscr. cap. 39.
(i) Lib. 2. cont. Eun.
(k) In cap. 12. Mat. hom. 4. & 17. Genes.
(l) Resp. ad Nebul. & alibi.
(m) Conc. Castel. p. 221.
(n) Cauin. 2. q. 2. c. 30 & q. 4. c. 8.
(o) Whita. de relig. c. de Euch. Hospin. part. 2. fol. 30. colloq. Abb. fol. 134. Schaffh. fol. 1. tom. 17. castel. p. 128.

where

where they see they will hurt their cause, either they deny them, or seeke by friuolous and fond expositions to auoyd and delude them. So the (p) Donatists (as p) Augustin noteth) would not confesse that, which would haue confounded them, when the Catholikes vrged it, *but after when an other point was in handling*: A fourth cause may be giuen, that as the Scorpion affordeth a remedy for her sting, and of the vipers flesh is made the counterpoyson; so God hath ordayned, that heretiques afford sufficient meanes to refute their errors: *Neither yet therfore* (as S. (q) Augustin writeth) *giue we any thanks to them, but to God alone. For that they should for our cause produce & discouer all these things by speaking or writing, truth enforced them, not charity inuited them.* And (r) Luther himselfe: *So must the enemies of truth confound and mock themselues for a reward of their blasphemies.* And (s) againe: *Since God ordayneth that folly is always ioyned with malice, Cain bewrayeth himselfe. And for this cause the defence of truth is easy against the aduersaries therof.* Wherupon (t) Hospinian thus writeth of the Lutherans: *They are become grieuous enemyes and aduersaryes, not so much of others, as of themselues; surely by a most euident testimony of Gods iudgement, and a worthy punishment and confusion for these kind of ambitions and contentious men.* Which I would God Protestants would obserue,

(p) Lib. ad Donat. post collat.

(q) Supr. n. 11.

(r) Cont. Ang. fol. 341.

(s) In cap. 4. Genes.

(t) Hospin. hist. sacr. fol.

obserue, not in Lutherans only, but also in other Protestants. For they should find, that they haue no heauier aduersaries then themselues, & that Protestants (as (u) Lactantius wrote of Cicero) cannot be more sorely confuted, then they are by Protestants themselues.

(u) Lib. 2. c. 9.

Faultes

Faults escaped in the printing.

Page	Line	Fault	Correction
81.	11.	himelf	himſelfe
81.	27.	vnles he	vnles he be
96.	6.	numb. 66.	numb. 96.
107.	19.	The	There
109.	23.	light of	*dele* of
116.	4.	credible	incredible
127.	7.	the	theſe
131.	6.	*dele*	haue bin
137.	2.	be	be by
140.	6.	fourth	third
147.	33.	waye	waxe
154.	7.	in	is
168.	23.	ſonde	ſponge
169.	3.	one	our
170.	33.	1525.	1535.
182.	24.	ſhould only	ſhould only ſay
184.	27.	prodigious	prodigious
205.	31.	boaſteth	boaſteth that
219.	vlt.	Taye	Faye
221.	33.	of fayth	faith of
222.	21.	firſt	fifth.

If any other faults haue eſcaped, it is deſired of the Gentle Reader, to correct them of his courteſy, the Author being far abſent from the Print.

THE

THE FIRST BOOKE.

Of the ſubſtance of the Proteſtants Church and Religion, and of their vncertainty therein.

CHAP. I.

BECAVSE, as after Plato and Ariſtotle, Tully ſayth very truly: *VVhoſoeuer will according to the order of reaſon treat of any thing, muſt firſt define or explicate the nature thereof, that it may be knowne what it is whereof he ſpeaketh*; and Proteſtants agree, that the definition is *the very ground of all diſputation*; before I do ſhew, who was the firſt author of the Proteſtant Church and Religion (which I will do in the ſecond booke) I will in this firſt define and determine what is a Proteſtant, and what is the Proteſtant Church and Religion. And becauſe Proteſtants in this matter (as in all others) are variable and inconſtant, ſometymes requiring many things to the making and conſtitution of a Proteſtant, & ſometymes being content with very

Lib. 1. offic.

Calvin. Inſtitut. cap. 4. ſect. Sadeel. in Refut. Theſ. Roſſam. cap. 20

few things, sometymes stretching the bounds of their Church most largly, otherwhiles drawing the very strait, according as it serueth to their present purpose; I will first discouer this their vncertainty about so weighty a matter, & afterward out of their owne principles and confessions of fayth, set downe what is indeed necessary to the very substance and being of a Protestant, and of their Church and Religion. And in this Chapter I will shew, how few they sometymes do admit to be of the Church, and how many things they require to the making of a Protestant; and in some chapters following, how many they at other tymes do graunt to be of their Church, and how few things they account necessary for to be a member thereof. That done I will make manifest, what is indeed necessary thereto.

They exclude Papists.

2. First of all therefore they sometymes exclude Catholiques, (whome they terme Papists) out of the Church, as is manifest by all their writings, in so much that the French Protestants in the 28. article of their confession say: *We openly affirme that where the word of God is not receiued, nor there is any profession of obedience due thereto, nor any vse of Sacraments, there, properly speaking, we cannot iudge to be any Church. Wherfore we condemne the Popish Conuenticles.* And D. Whitaker in his second booke against Dureus & 2. section, is so earnest that he sayth: *I will not allow the very name of a lawfull Church vnto the Roman Church, because it hath nothing, which a true Church ought to haue.* And both he in his 2. Controuersy 6. question 3. Chapter, *D. Sutliue* in his first booke of the Church 3. *cap.* and *lib.* 2. *cap.* 9. *M. Perkins* in his reformed Catholique towards the end, *Caluin* in his book against the Chaunter of Lions, *Beza* in his of the notes of the Church, the

the Confession of Saxony in the Chapter of the Church, and many others do reckon diuers articles, for euery one whereof they pronounce Papists to be out of the Church. And because their opinion herein is well inough knowne, and hereafter also we shall haue occasiõ to shew how haynously they contemne the Popedome or Papistry, I will heere rehearse no more of their sayings touching this point. The like sentence they sometymes pronounce of the Anabaptists and Arians. For thus speaketh the confession of Ausburg Cap. 9. *They condemne the Anabaptists, who disallow the baptisme of infants, and think them to be saued without baptisme.* And the Confession of Switzerland *cap.* 20. *We condemne the Anabaptists, who deny that infants ought to be baptized.* The same is manifest by the English Confession c. 38. & by the Confession of Basle c. 24. & others. Of Arians they giue this verdict & in the forsayd Confession of Ausburg in the first article: *They condemne all heresies risen against this article* (of the Trinity) *as the Manichees, Arians, Eunomians &c.* And in like sort the French Confession art. 6. the English art. 1. the consent of Poland, and others; in so much as in England the Protestants haue burnt some Arians. Anabaptists. Arians.

3. Sometymes also they thrust out all heretickes. For thus writeth *Luther* in his explication of the Creed. *Neither Gentile, Iew, Heretike, or any sinner is saued, vnlesse he make attonement with the Church, and in all things, thinke, do, and teach the same.* And the Magdeburgians in the preface of their 6. Century: *Neither heretikes, nor deuisers or patrons of fanaticall opinions, are of Christ, but they are of Antichrist, and of the diuell, and appertaine to Antichrist and the diuell: they are the impostume and plague of the people of God.* The ministers of the Prince Heretikes Lutherans.

Elector of Saxony in the Conference held at Aldburg, in the 3. writ, cast out of the Church all, *VVho* (say they) *wittingly and willingly defend such corruptions of doctrine, as haue byn condemned by the lawfull iudgment and consent of the Catholike Church.* And the Ministers of the Duke of Saxony in the 4. writ of the sayd Conference, pronounce this sentence: *VVhosoeuer they are, that do cloak and defend corruptions of the word of God, that is, of the articles of sayth, after they haue byn admonished; we iudge not to be true members of Christ, vnlesse they repent.* And Vrbanus Regius, one of the first and cheifest scholers of *Luther*, in his Catechisme sayth: *All Heretikes are out of the Church.* The same teacheth Schusselburg, a principall superintendent amongst the *Lutherans* in his Catalogue of heresies, and many others. As for the Sacramentaries, thus professeth the French Confession in the 6. article: *VVe detest all Sects and heresies which haue byn reiected by the holy Fathers as S. Hilary, S. Athanase, S. Ambrose, S. Cyrill.* Whereupon Sadeel in his preface of his answere to the abiured articles, sayth: *Our Confession of sayth condemneth all Heretikes.* Likewise the Confession of Basle in 24. article writeth in this sort: *VVe driue away all, whosoeuer dissenting from the Society of the holy Church, do either bring in, or follow strange & wicked doctrines.* And Peter Martyr in his Common places, in the title of heretiks: *This in summe I will say, heretikes are not otherwise to be deals with all, then Infidells & Iewes.* Caluin also in his 2. booke of Institution cap. 15. number. 1. *Rightly Augustin denyeth Heretikes to haue the same foundation with the godly, albeit they preach the name of Christ.* And in his instruction against the Libertines: *That we may speake properly, Heretikes are not vnlike to wolues or theeues, but much worse.* Beza in his book of punishing Heretiks: *If one terme Heretikes faithless apostates*

Sacramentaries.

apostatas, he shall giue them their due title. And againe: *Heretikes affirme Christ in word, and deny him indeed.* Danæus in his 5. Controuersy and 691. pag. *An heretike, condemned by lawfull iudgement, and actually cast out of the Church, is not of the visible Church, nor of the inuisible neither, actually or apparently, so long as he remaineth in that state.* Polanus in his 7. booke which he termeth Syntagma, cap. 5. *Heretikes, whiles they remayne such are not members of the Catholique Church.* And Vorstius in his Anti-bellarmin pag. 79. *The Ghospellers do esteem Antichrist in common to be euery heretike who opposeth himselfe either openly and plainly, or closely and indirectly to Christ and his doctrine.* And in the 121. pag. *There is no controuersy betweene vs and our aduersaries touching heretikes, Schismatikes and Apostatas properly and truly so called, that they are altogether out of the Church of Christ.* Thus forraine Protestants. In England, his Maiesty in his epistle to Cardinal Peron written by Casaubon: *The King damneth and detesteth those, who either haue departed from the fayth of the Catholike Church, and are become heretikes, or from the Communion, and are become Schismatikes.* The Apology of the Church of England part. 3. diuis. 3. *We condemne all sortes of the old heretiks, as the Arians, the Eutichians &c. and shortly, all them that haue a wicked opinion either of God the Father, or of Christ, or of the holy Ghost, or of any other point of Christian Religion: for so much as they be confuted by the Ghospell of Christ we plainly pronounce them for damnable and detestable persons, and defy them euen to the diuell.* D. Whitaker in the preface of his Controuersies: *If we be heretikes, it is reason they should warne all theirs to fly from vs.* And Controuer. 2. question. 3. cap. 4. *That he proueth heretikes and Apostatas and Schismatikes not to be members of the true Church maketh nothing against vs. None of our men euer taught that.* The like he hath question 5. cap. 1.

English Protestants.

and 18. D. Sutline in his first booke of the Church cap. 1. *Heretikes are not of the Church*. D. Morton in his Apology 1. part. 1. booke cap. 3 affirmeth, that *Heretikes are not to be accounted of the Church in truth but in name, not indeed but equiuocally*. Finally D. White in his way to the Church pag 110. *All heretickes teach the truth in some things, and yet we deny them to be the Church of God*. And in the defence of the same way cap. 8. sect. 1. *There is little or no difference betweene the Diuell and an Apostata, or Heretike*.

They exclude Schismatiks.

4. The same censure they sometymes giue of Schismatikes, as appeareth by the words of his Maiesty, D. Whitaker, and Vorstius already rehearsed. Besides, Luther in his great Catechisme tom. 5. pag. 628. affirmeth the sense of that article, *The Communion of Saints*, to be this: *I believe that there is on earth a litle Congregation of Saints, agreeing in all things without sectes or Schismes*. And Melancthon in his booke against Swenfeild tom. 2. pag. 201. *Neither is there more then one Church, the Sponse of Christ, neither doth this company consist of diuers Sectes*. Salomon Gelnerus in his Common places the 24. place of the Church: *Catholiks are opposite to Schismatikes & heretiks*. The same teacheth Schusselburg in his 8. tome of the Catalogue of heretikes, pag. 726. 727. Amongst the Sacramentaries, the Switzers in their Confession, article 17. do thus professe: *We so much esteeme the Communion with the true Church of Christ, as that we teach, that those cannot liue before God, who communicate not with his true Church*. And the French Protestants in theirs, article 26. *We believe that none can lawfully withdraw themselues from the assemblies*. Bullinger in his Epitome or Compendium of fayth 6. booke, 11. cap: *They be out of the Church, who vpon enuy or contention separate themselues from her, & withe-*

Lutherās.

Sacramētaries.

ouse will haue some thing peculiar to themselues. Musculus also in his common places, in the title of the church: *The vnity of Heretiks and Schismatikes is bastard and diuided. True, entier, and Catholike vnity is not among Schismatikes.* And in the title of Schismatikes: *A Schismatike putteth himselfe in daunger of losse of his salustion, in departing from the Communion of the flock of the Lord. For by that departure, he is not only separated and diuided from that Ecclesiasticall and externall society of the faythfull, but also from participation of the bloud and spirit of Christ.* Caluin likewise in his treatise of the necessity of reforming the Church: *VVe do professe the vnity of the Church, such as is described by S. Paul, to be most deare vnto vs; and we accurse all them, that shall any way violate it.* And in his fourth booke of Institutions chap. 1. numb. 2: *Vnlesse vnder Christ our head, we be vnited to all the rest of his members, there is no hope for vs of the euerlasting inheritance. For we cannot haue two or three* (Churches) *vnlesse Christ be torne in pieces.* And num. 4. *Out of the lap the Church there is no saluation: departure from thence is alwayes pernicious.* Againe num. 10: *God maketh so great account of the Communion with his Church as he holdeth him for a renegate and fugitiue, whosoeuer obstinatly separateth himselfe from any Christian society, which retaineth the true vse of the word and Sacraments.* And he addeth, that the forsaking of the Church, *Is the denial of God and Christ.* The like doctrine he deliuereth in his Catechisme, vpon the 1. Cor. cap. 1. and other where Polanus in his Theses part. 2. sayth: *Schismaticall Churches are to be forsaken.* And Bucanus in his places, loc. 41. of the Church, quest. 33. auoucheth Schismatiks to be out of the Church, and quest. 5. that *they are not vniuocally a Church*, that is, they haue not the true nature of a Church. The same sayth Danæus in his treatise of Antichrist cap. 17. And in his 3. booke of the Church cap. 5. writeth

thus: *Schismatikes actually excommunicated and cast out of the Church by lawfull sentence, are no more of the visible Church. For* (sayth he) *the marke that you be of the visible Church, is this, that you outwardly professe the sayth, and communicate in Sacraments with the rest of the Church.* And he addeth, that such are neither *actually of the invisible Church, but only in possibility, and that the holy Fathers liken such to Heathens, Pagans, and infidells.* And in his Apology for the Swytzers Churches he defineth Schisme to be *a separation from the rest of the body of the Catholike Church.* Zanchius also in his treatise of the Church cap. 7. teacheth, that Schismatikes are not in the Church. And Iunius in his 3. booke of the Church c. 5. approveth the same of such Schismatikes, as seperate themselues from the whole Church. The strangers in England writing to Beza in the 24 epistle haue these words in their 13. article: *Whosoever is lawfully excommunicated of a particuler Church, or casteth himselfe of vpon vnlawfull causes, and with scandall, in that doth loose all priuiledge of the Catholike Church.* And Beza answereth them in the name of the Church of Geneua in this manner: *Your thirteenth article we wholy receiue as most orthodoxall.* Casaubon in his 15. exercitation against Baronius num. 6. *It is an vndoubted truth, that how often soeuer a pious flock is sayned to a true Bishop, there is a Church of God; in so much that if any forsake that Church, it cannot be doubted, but that he is out of the Church.* Finally, Chamier in his epistle to Armand, excludeth Schismatikes out of the Church, because (sayth he) *they want the sincerity of the Sacraments.* Amongst our English Protestants, his Maiesty in his foresayd epistle to Cardinall Peron, *All these testimonies of Augustin, proue only this, that there is no hope of saluation for those, who leaue the Communion of the Catholike Church; which the King willingly graunteth.* D. Whi-

English Protestats

taker

taker in his 2. controuer. 5. quett. 6. cap. sayth: *It is false, that hereticall and Schismaticall Churches be true Churches.* Againe: *The Catholike Church consisteth not of deuided, but of vnited members.* And cap. 2: *The true and Catholike Church is that, which consisteth of Catholiks.* D. Fulke in his booke of the succession of the Church: *What auailed it them (eternall saluation) to haue byn sound in Religion and doctrine, seing they were cut of from the Communion of the true Church, in which alone saluation is, and from her true head? What killeth it whether one, being drawne by heresy or Schisme, from the body of Christ, be subiect to euerlasting damnation?* D. Humfrey in his answere to the 3. reason of F. Campian: *We confesse, that he is vndone, who is separated from the fellowship of the Church.* And D. Feild in his first booke of the Church, cap. 7: *The name of the Catholike Church is applyed to distinguish men holding the sayth in vnity, from Schismatiks.* And in his 2. booke c. 2. he sayth, that Schismatikes are not Catholike Christians. Thus we see how Protestants sometymes do teach, that the true Church consisteth of Catholiks, & of members vnited not deuided, that it hath no Schismes or sects: That Schismatiks are not Catholiks, that their vnity is not true, nor Catholike, that their Churches ought to be forsaken, that they are not vniuocally Churches, nor true Churches, that they are not members of the true Church, but out of the Church, altogether out of the Church, and actually neither of the visible nor inuisible Church, and that this is an vndoubted truth: which cõfession of theirs must be well noted and kept in mind, for thereby is ouerthrowne (as we shall see in the 2. booke) their only argument wherwith they endeauour to proue, that their Church was before Luther, and also is defaced their only essentiall mark of finding the true

Church, by the truth of doctrine. For Schismatikes (as we shall heare them confesse in the 2. booke) hold true doctrine, and nevertheles (as here they acknowledge) are not of the true Church.

They exclude those that deny any fundamẽtal article.

5. In like manner they do commonly debarre from their Church, all such as deny any principall or fundamentall point of fayth; Melancthon in his booke of common places in the title of the Church: *They are not members of the Church who pertinaciously maintaine errours opposite to the foundation.* And in his answere to the Bauarian articles: *Saints may haue errours, but not such as ouerthrow the foundation.* In his examen of those that are to take orders: *Agreement in the foundation, is a thing necessary to the vnity of the Church.* And

Lutherãs.

vpon the 3. cap. of the 1. epistle to Timothy: *The foundation is held in the Church, otherwise there should be no Church at all.* And in his 79. propositior, tom. 4: *It is most certaine, that those companies are not the Church of God, who either are altogether ignorant of the Ghospell, or impugne some article of the foundation, that is, some article of fayth or doctrine of the decalogue, or maintaine open idols.* Chemnitius in his common places pa. 3. title of the Church: *Neither can these be acknowledged for the true Church, who imbrace fundamentall errours.* And the Lutherans in the conference at Ratisbon, Sess. 14. Hutter in his Analysis of the Confession of Auspurg, Gesner in his 24. place, Adam Francis in his 11. place, and other Lutherans commonly agree, that the Church *cannot erre Fundamentally, or in the Foundation.* And the Confession of Saxony giueth this note, to know who are in the

Sacramẽtaries.

Church: *Those who hold the Foundation.* As for Sacramentaries, Caluin in his 4. booke of Institutions cap. 2. num 1: *So soone as a lye hath broken into the castle of Religion, the summe of necessary doctrine is ouerthrowne, the vse of*

Sacra-

Sacraments is fallen, certainly the destruction of the Church ensueth, euen as a mans life is lost, when his throat is cut, or his vitall parts deadly wounded. And soone after: *It is certaine, that there is no Church, where lyes and errour haue gotten to the toppe.* And cap. 19. num. 17: *Without doubt the Church of the faythfull must agree in all the heads of our religion.* Sadeel in his answere to the Theses held at Poina cap. 12: *I thinke the matter is thus to be defined by the word of God, that if any in what Church soeuer dissent in the foundation of fayth, and be obstinate in their errours: such appertaine not to the vnity of the Church.* The like he hath in his answere to Arthure, cap. 12. Vesinus in his Catechisme quest. 54. cap. 4: *The whole Church erreth not, nor wholly, nor in the foundation.* Polanus in his Thesis of the Church fayth: *The Church erreth not in the foundation.* The same teacheth Zanchius in his treatise of the Church c. 7. Lubbertus in his 2. booke of the Church c 3. Vorstius in his Anti-bellarmin pag. 139. Bucanus in his 41. place, and other Sacramentaries commonly. And with them herein agree our English Protestants. For thus sayth his Maiesty in his epistle to Cardinall Peron: *The Churches are vnited in vnity of fayth and doctrine, in those heads which are necessary to saluation.* And D. Whitaker in the preface of his Controuersies: *The foundations of fayth are of that nature, that one being shaken, nothing in all religion remaineth sound.* And Contr. 2. quest. 4. cap. 1: We say, that the Church cannot erre in things simply necessary. Which he often repeateth in the 3. cap. And quest. 5. cap. 17: *If any fundamentall doctrine be taken away, the Church straight way falleth.* And cap. 18: *The fundamentall articles are those, on which our fayth relyeth, as the house vpon the foundation.* Againe: *If any fundamentall and essentiall principle of fayth be ouerturned or shaken, it cannot be truly called a Church.* English Protestãts

And

And quest. 6. cap. 3: *That is no true Church which taketh away one only foundation.* The same he teacheth in his 1. booke of the scripture cap. 7. sect. 8. and cap. 12. sect. 3. M. Perkins in his explication of the Creed: *If any man or Church, retaine, or defend, obstinatly, or of willfull ignorance, a fundamentall errour, we must not accompt them any more Christians or Churches.* D. Sutliue in his first booke of the Church cap. 1: *Those blemishes take away the name of the true Church, which are against the grounds of fayth.* D. Feild in his 2. booke of the Church cap. 3: *Purity free from fundamentall and essentiall errour, is necessarily required in the Church.* D. Morton in the 1. part of his Apology, booke 2. cap 38: *Purity of doctrine in fundamentall principles of fayth, is required to the being and constitution of the Church.* And in his answere to the Protestants Apology l. 4. c. 3. Sect. 5: *The deniall of fundamentall doctrines, doth exclude men from salvation, and disannulleth the name of the Church in the gainsayers.* D. White in his way to the Church pag. 110: *We do not thinke every company to be the true Church, that holdeth only some points of the true fayth: but it is requisite that the foundation be holden.* And in his defence of the way cap. 17: *A fundamentall point is that which belongs to the substance of fayth, and is so necessary that there can be no salvation without the knowledge and explicite fayth thereof.* And surely they all, and all tymes, ought to affirme this, seeing they deliuer truth of doctrine, as an essentiall marke of the Church, which they must needs vnderstand (and so Vorstius in his Anti-bellarmin pag. 148. expresseth it) of true doctrine in fundamentall poines. And this their doctrine touching this matter, I earnestly commend to the memory of the Reader, because it is necessary to find out, what a Protestant is, and also is one of the grounds, whereby it may appeare,

that

that there was no Protestant Church before Luther, because before him there was no company which held all the same fundamentall points of doctrine which Protestants do hold.

6. Finally; they sometyms shut out of their Church all those, who deny any one point of fayth, be it fundamentall or other. For thus writeth the Apology of the Confession of Auspurge: *The Church of Christ is not among them, who defend naughty opinions, contrary to the Ghospell.* And *Luther* in his epistle to Count Albert: *It is not inough, if in other things he confesse Christ and his Ghospell. For who denieth Christ in one article or word, denieth him, who is denied in all, because there is but one Christ, the same in all his words.* And vpon the 17. cap. of Deuteronomy: *Faith suffereth nothing, and the word toleratteth nothing, but the word must be perfectly pure, and the doctrine alwayes sound throughout.* And vpon the 17. cap. of S. Matthew: *Fayth must be round, that is, believing all articles, though small ones. For who believeth not one article rightly, believeth nothing rightly, as Iames sayth, Who offendeth in one, is guilty of all: and so who in one article doubteth or believeth not (at least obstinately) dissolveth the roundnes of the graine, and so can do no good.* And vpon the 5. cap. to the Galathians: *In divinity a small errour overthroweth all the doctrine. Doctrine is like to a Mathematicall point, it cannot be deuided, that is, it cannot suffer either addition or detraction.* And when Zuinglius and his followers desired of the Lutherans to be esteemed as their brethren, Melanchon (as Hospinian reporteth in his Sacramentarian history fol. 81.) roughly sayd vnto them: *We meruaile with what conscience they can account vs for brethren, whome they iudge to erre in doctrine.* And againe fol. 82. *Luther* gravely spake vnto them, saying: *We greatly meruaile how they could hold him for a brother, if they thought his doctrine to be naught.* And the same

They exclude all that deny any article of fayth.

Lutherans.

same Melanchon togeather with Brentius writeth thus to the Lantgrave: *Perhaps Christians, who are entangled in some errour, which they do not obstinatly defend, may be tolerated as brethren, but they which not only bring false doctrine into the Church, but also maintaine it, are not to be acknowledged for brethren.* And againe Melanchon in his examen of those who are to take orders, tom. 3. *There are in that company (of the Church) many who are not Saints, but yet agreeing in doctrine.* The Deuines of Wittemberg in their refutation of the orthodoxall consent pag. 73: *Like as he who keepeth the whole law and offendeth in one (as Iames the Apostle witnesseth) is guilty of all: so who believeth not one word of Christ, albeit he seeme to belive the other articles of the Creed, yet believeth nothing, and is to be damned as incredulous. For euery heretike did not impugne euery article of fayth, but commonly each of them of purpose impugned some one or other, whome nonetheles the Church iustly condemned as heretikes, if they pertinaciously stood in their errours.* Schusselburg also in his 3. tom. of the Catalogue of Heretiks, pag. 85. *Christian fayth is one copulatiue, and who denieth one article of fayth, calleth in doubt the whole body of the heauenly doctrine.* Which he repeateth againe in the next pag. And tome 8. pag. 361: *The Lutherans do fly him, who depraueth the doctrine of truth in any article whatsoeuer.* And in his 2. booke of Caluinisticall diuinity, article 1: *We are certaine by the testimony of Gods word, that an errour in one false doctrine, obstinatly defended, maketh an heretike. For S. Chrysostome vpon the epistle to the Galathians sayd most truly, that he corrupteth the whole doctrine who ouerthroweth it in the least article. And Ambrose wrote rightly to the Virgin Demetrias, That he is out of the number of the faythfull, and hath no part in the inheritance of Saints, who disagreeth in any thing from the Catholike truth.* Thus the Lutherans. Peter Martyr in his epistle to the straungers in England

Sacram. tom.

tom. 2. loc. col. 136: *VVe answere, all the words of God, as farre forth as they proceeded from him, are of equall weighte and authority, and therefore none may receive this, and refuse that as false. Iames sayth boldly, who sinneth in one, becommeth guilty of all. That, if it have place in keeping of the commandements, is also true in points of fayth.* Sadeel in his index of Turrians Repetitions pag. 806: *I sayd, that it was no true Church, which teacheth doctrine repugnant to the written word of God.* And his Maiesty in his Monitory epistle pag. 97. in Latin: *I call God to witnes, that I hold him not for a Christian who in this learned age believeth that.* (to wit, that Enoch and Elias are to come.) And D. Morton in his answere to the Protestants Apology lib. 4. c. 2. sect. 3. after he had sayd, that in a Church, albeit corrupted with errour and superstition, yet if it do not ruinate the foundation, the erroneous & superstitious professors may be saued, adddeth: *VVhich notwithstanding we must so vnderstand, as that the errors and superstitions do not proceed from knowledge but from ignorance, which ignorance is not affected but simple.* Thus we see that Protestants somtymes confesse that true fayth is like a graine, or Mathematicall point, which cannot be parted; that the articles of fayth are one copulative, and cannot be deuided, that who so obstinatly denieth one article, believeth, truly, none; that the obstinate deniall of any one poynt of fayth is sufficient to damne, or to make an heretik, and no brother of the faythfull, or member of the Church. And finally, that she is no true Church, who willfully maintaineth any one thing repugnant to the Ghospell or word of God. Which indeed is most true, and is the doctrine of the holy Fathers and Catholiks, and I would to God Protestants would constantly stand vnto it.

English Protestits

7: By all, which hath bynrehearsed in this

XUM

chapter out of Protestants, it appeareth how many sortes of Christians, Protestants do sometymes exclude out of the Church, namely Papists, Anabaptists, Arians, al Heretiks, all Schismatiks, all those who deny any fundamentall point of fayth, and finally al who obstinatly deny any point whatsoeuer of fayth, or of the word of God. And how many things they sometymes require to the making and being of a Protestant, to wit, that he believe all and euery point of their fayth, and obstinatly dissent in none. To which their doctrine, if they would (as I haue sayd) alwayes constantly stand, it would easily appeare, first how small a company the Protestants Church is, and how little it is spread through the world, and much lesse Catholike or vniuersal, seeing there is no Prouince, nor scarse any citty, in which all Protestants agree amongst themselues in al points of their doctrine. Secondly it would easily appeare that the Protestant Church was neuer before *Luther*, seeing there is no apparence, that before him there was any company of Christians who in all points of doctrine agreed with Protestants. But Protestants (as I sayd in the Preface) accommodate their doctrine and opinions to tymes and occasions. And the tymes, when they deny Papists to be of the Church, are when they exhort them to leaue the Roman Church, or excuse their owne reuolting from her, or when they dehort others from returning to her. For at all these tymes, it serueth to their purpose to deny that Papists are of the Church, or in the way of saluation; which at other tymes, as we shall see in the next chapter, they are content to graunt. As the tymes when they exclude Anabaptists, Arians, Heretiks, Schismatiks, and all that deny either fundamental

damentall or other articles of fayth, out of the Church, are, whome either the euidence of truth enforceth them thereto, or when they are asshamed to acknowledge such vgly monsters for brethren and members of their Church, or would exhort such as haue left their company to returne vnto them, and keep others from forsaking them: or finally would brag of the agreement and purity in doctrine of their company. For at those tymes it serueth their turne to renounce all the forsayd kind of men, whom at other tymes, especially when we demaund of them, who were of their Church before Luther, they are most willing to receiue, as their kind brethren; diligently scraping & gathering such shreeds and clouts, when they perceiue their owne nakednes and beggary, which themselues, when they thought they were rich and had no need thereof, most disdainfully cast on the dunghills, as shall appeare in the chapters following.

CHAP. II.

That Protestants sometymes account Papists for members of their Church.

IN the former chapter we haue seene how sparing Protestants sometyms be in admitting other into their Church, now we shall see how liberall they be at other tymes, in so much that they graunt, not only all those, whome in the former chapter they reiected, but also their professed enemies, idolaters, Infidells, Atheists, Antichrist himselfe, and all, whosoeuer vnder the name of Christians, impugne the deede or

doctrine of the Pope, to be their brethren, their fellowes, and members of their Church. This we will shew concerning the Papists in this chapter, and of the others afterward.

Lutherus. 1. That Protestants sometymes do acknowledge Papists to be in the Church is manifest. First by their open confession thereof. For in the preface of their Confession of Ausburg, speaking of themselues and Papists, they say: *VVe are all soldiers vnder one Christ.* And Luther in his epistle against the Anabaptists (as Caluin in his booke against the Chaunter of Lions, and D. Whitaker in the place here after cited do confesse) writeth: *That in Popery is true Christianity, yea the kernell of Christianity, and many pious and great Saints.* Againe: *If Christianity be vnder the Pope, then it must be the body and member of Christ.* And vpon the 28. chapter of Genesis: *VVe confesse, that there is a Church among the Papists, because they haue Baptisme, absolution, the text of the Gospell, and many godly men are among them.* Caluin in his 140. epistle to Sozin: *I think I haue sufficiently proued, that in Popery there remayneth some Church, albeit halfe destroyed, and if you will, broken and deformed.* And vpon the 2. chap. of the 2 epistle to the Thessalonians: *I confesse it is the temple of God, in which the Pope ruleth, and he calleth it the very sanctuary of God.* And, de vera reform. pag. 332. layth, *that S Paul affirmeth that Antichrist* (whom he will haue to be the Pope) *shall sit in the temple of God.* And lib. de scandalis pag. 103: *In the midest of Gods temple.* And lib. cont. Precentorem pag. 372: *In the very sanctuary of God.* And Respons. ad Sadolet: *In the midest of Gods sanctuary.* Surely this is to graunt, that the Romane Church, in which the Pope sitteth, is the very temple and very sanctuary of God. And in his answeare to Sadolet; *VVe deny not those to be Churches of*

Papists serue vnder christ.

The kernel of Christianity in Popery.

The Body of Christ

Sacramentaries.

Christ

Christ, which you governe. In his 4. booke of Institutions, chap. 2. num. 11. he sayth, that among Papists *Gods covenant remayned inviolable.* And num. 12 *We deny not, that there are Churches among them. Neither deny we, but there remaine Churches vnder him* (the Pope he meaneth) *tyranny, but which he hath almost killed.* Iunius in his booke of the Church, cap. 17. writeth that the Popish Church, *as farre as it hath that which belongeth to the definition of a Church, is a Church; that it hath not giuen vp the ghost, that it hath all aliue things, and of Gods part is yet the Church.* Zanchius in the preface of his booke of the nature of God: *Satan euen in the very Roman Church could not bring all things to that passe, that it should no more haue the forme of a Christian Church.* And soone after: *Wherefore the Roman Church is yet the Church of Christ.* Plessy in his booke of the Church 2. chap. auoucheth, that the Roman Church is the Spouse of Christ, is not yet forsaken of him, that as a Mother, she beareth children to God (which he repeateth againe in the 10. chap.) that she retaineth life, and that the name of the Church ought no more to be denied to her, then the name of a man vnto a liuing man. Bucan in his 41. place of the Church, quest. 5: *The assemblies of Papists are Churches, as a man infected with leprosy or besides his wittes, doth not leaue to be a man.* Polanus in his first part and Thesis of the Church: *The Roman Church truly is a Church; because Antichrist sitteth in the Church.* And in his Syntagme of diuinity lib. 7. c. 8: *The present Roman Church is yet the Church of Christ.* Serauia in his defence of the degrees of ministers, pag. 30: *The Roman Church is a Church, and mark what I say more, she is our mother, by whom and by whom, God did regenerate vs.* And pag. 33. *The couenant of God remayneth this day in the Latin Church.* Boyssel in his confutation of Spondi pag. 18. Pro-

Not yet killed.

Not yet dead.

Yet the Church of Christ.

Spouse of Christ.

clude not the Roman Church out of the vniuersall Church. I acknowledge her to be yet in the couenant of God; which he repeateth oftentymes. And pag. 122: *The Roman Church, is the Church of God.* Pag. 19: *It is a member of the vniuersall Church.* p. 283: *It is yet the Church, Spouse and temple of God.* And pag. 822: *We deny not, that the Roman Church is the Church of Iesus Christ, redeemed by him.* Vorstius in his Anti-bellarmin p. 188: *The vulgar Roman church hath not yet lost all spirituall life, is not yet openly deuorced from Christ.* And Peter Martyr in his epistle to Bullinger, writeth, that he gaue counsaile, that the Papists & they should not call one the other Heretiks, but account themselues for brethren. As for English Protestants, his Maiesty in his speach to the Parlament, anno 1605. 9. of November, and put forth in print, speaketh thus: *We do iustly confesse, that many Papists, especially our forefathers, laying their only trust vpon Christ and his merits, may be, and oftentymes are saued; detesting in that point, and thinking the cruelty of Puritans worthy of fire, that will admit no saluation to any Papist.* And in his epistle to Cardinall Peron: *The Roman, the Greek &c. Churches, are members of the Catholike Church.* And D. Andrews in his Tortura Torti towards the end, speaketh thus to the Papists: *We are content to call you members of the Catholike Church, though not sound members.* Hooker in his 3. book of Ecclesiasticall policy pag. 128: *We gladly acknowledge them to be of the family of Iesus Christ.* And lib. 5. pag. 188: *They should acknowledge so much neuertheles still due to the same Church* (of Rome) *as to be held and reputed a part of the house of God, a limme of the visible Church of Christ.* D. Couel in his defence of Hooker pag. 68. sayth: *We affirme them of the Church of Rome, to be parts of the Church of Christ, and that those that liue and dye in that Church, may notwithstanding be saued.* D. Barlow in his 3. sermon

Clerum:

Yet the Church Spouse & temple of God.

Yet aliue.

English Protestans

Papists may be saued.

Members of the Catholike Church.

Of the family of Christ.

May be saued. Note,

Clerum: *The learneder writers do acknowledge the Church of Rome, to be the Church of God.* M. Bunny in his treatise of Pacification, sect. 18: *Neither of vs* (Papists & Protestants) *may iustly account the other to be none of the Church of God. We are no seuerall Church from them, nor they from vs.* D. Some against Penry in diuers places auoucheth, *That Papists are not altogeather aliens from Gods couenant. That in the iudgement of all learned men, and all reformed Churches, there is in Popery a Church, a Ministery, a true Christ: If you think that all the Popish sect which dyed in the Popish Church, are damned, you think absurdly, and dissent from the iudgement of the learned Protestants.* D. Whitaker in his fourth controuersy quest. 5. cap. 3. calleth the Papists Church, *the temple of God, more then halfe dead, and almost decayed.* And that temple, wherein the Apostle saith, that Antichrist shall sit, and which he affirmeth to be the Roman Church, he termeth *the very Church of God, the true Church of God, the society of the faythfull, the liuely temple composed of liuely stones; such as are the faythfull & the elect.* And he addeth: *There is among them* (Papists) *some Ministery, and some preaching of the word, which doubtlesse effordeth saluation vnto some. And as the gifts of God are without repentance; so the couenant which God made with Christian people, is not quite broken.* And cont. 2. quest. 5. cap. 15. after he had confessed, that Luther had sayd, that in Popery are all the goods belonging to Christians, the keyes, the office of preaching, true Christianity, and the very kernell of Christianity, he addeth: *These things are indeed among them.* M. Powell in his 2. booke of Antichrist, cap. 2. graunteth the Roman Church to be the true Church, albeit with a new kind of distinction he deny the Popish church. And D. Rainolds in his 5. Thesis, albeit he say that the Roman Church be more then sickly and weake,

Gods couenant with Papists.

yet he dares not say that the is quite dead. And D. White in his way, p. 352. sayth, *That Popery in as much as it differeth from vs, is not to be imagined by vs to be another Church distinct in place and countries from the true Church of Christ: but we affirme it to be a contagion, raging in the midst of the Church of Christ it selfe.* And in his defence c. 37. pag. 355: *I neuer denied the Church of Rome to be the visible Church of God, wherein our auncestors professed the truth, and were saued.* And cap. 41. pag. 408: *Professing the Church of Rome it selfe in all ages, to haue byn the visible Church of God.* Lastly D. Hall in his Rome Irreconciliable lect. 1. sayth, that the Roman Church *is a true visible Church, but not sound*, and that it differeth from the Protestant Church, *As the sick from the whole.* Hereto I adde, that oftentymes they call the Roman Church their Mother, which hath borne them to Christ, as we shall rehearse hereafter, & that before Luthers tyme they seeke their Church in Popery, and amongst the Papists.

2. Secondly I proove this same out of that which diuers tymes they graunt, that the Roman Church holdeth all the fundamentall articles of fayth, which themselues commonly teach (as hereafter shall be shewed) to suffice to make a Church. Their Confession of Ausburg in the 21. chapter hath these wordes: *This is almost the summe of doctrine among vs, in which as it may seeme, there is nothing which differeth from scripture, or from the Catholike Church, or from the Roman Church, so farre as it appeareth by writers. All the dissension is about some few abuses, which haue crept into Churches without certaine authority.* Whereby we see that the first and auncientest Protestants, publikly professed, that they differed not from the Roman Church in the summe of doctrine, but that all

That Papists hold the foundation of fayth.

Lutherās.

The same of faith in Popery.

their

their disagreement was about some few abuses. And albeit the wordes be somewhat altered in the printed copies; yet that they were in the originall copie which was presented to Charles 5. Emperour, is manifest by Fabritius, who repeateth them so out of that copie; by Pappus, in his 3. defence against *Sturmius*, who so also reporteth them; by Zanchius in his dispute between two Deuines, where he repeateth these wordes out of the said Confession: *There is nothing in our doctrine which differeth from the church of Rome, as far as it is knowne by writers*: and finally by Hieremias Patriarch of Constantinople in his censure vpon the said Confession, it being sent vnto him by the Protestants, where he thus writeth to them: *Ye say, yee agree in all things with the Latins, and that the difference betwixt you and them, is only touching some abuses*: likwise Luther in his forelaid epist. cont. Anabap: *We confesse that in Popery is much good belonging to Christians, yea all Christian good, to wit, that in Popery is the true Scripture, true baptisme, the true Sacrament of the altar, the true keyes for remission of sinnes, the true office of preaching, the true Catechisme, as the Lords prayer, the ten commandements, and the articles of faith.* Whereupon Schusselburg in his 8. tome of the Catalogue of heretikes pag. 439. saith: *We deny not but that Luther sayd that all Christian goods are in Popery, and come from thence vnto vs* Iohn Regius in his consideration of the censure &c: *Albeit the Ministery of Papists be corrupted with many traditions and inuentions of men, yet it had that which was necessary to saluation, to wit the Canonicall scripture, the Creed &c.* Leonard Crentzen: *The bishop of Rome holdeth the same foundation of the Catholike faith 1. Cor. 3. which and the Catholik apostolik Church do acknowledge, although there be some difference of opinions in certaine circumstances.*

Coeleus anno 1538 Vlebergcausa 17.

All Christiā good.

What was needfull to saluation.

The foundation of Fayth.

Thus the Lutherans. Of the Sacramentaries, Junius in his 5. controuersy lib. 3. cap. 19. writeth thus of Papists, Lutherans, and Caluinists: *VVe agree in the essentiall foundation.* Zanchius in his foresayd preface: *In despite of the Diuell that Church (of Rome) hath kept the principall grounds of fayth.* Boysseul also in his forenamed confutation pag. 79: *VVe acknowledge that it is pure in the cheife articles of Christian Religion.* And Vorstius in his Anti-bellarmin pag. 188. *It is manifest that there are many in that company (of Papists) who rightly hold the fundamentall points of our Religion.* And of the English Protestants, his Maiesty in his monitory epistle pag. 148. plainly intimateth that Papists *do stick vnto the auncient foundations of the old true Catholike and Apostolike fayth.* M. Hooker in his 3. booke of Ecclesiasticall policy pag. 128. sayth: *Touching those maine points of Christian truth, wherein they constantly still persist, we gladly acknowledge them to be of the family of Iesus Christ.* D. Whitaker in his 2. cont. quest. 5. cap. 14: *Papists haue the Scripture, Baptisme, Catechisme, the articles of fayth, the ten commandments, the Lords prayer; and those things came to vs from them.* D. Whitgift in his answere to the admonition pag. 40: *Papistry confesseth the same articles of fayth that we do, although not sincerely.* And pag. 62: *Papists believe the same articles of fayth that we do.* M. Perkins in the preface of his reformed Catholike: *By a reformed Catholike I vnderstand any one that holds the same necessary heads of Religion, with the Roman Church, yet so as he parts of, and reiects all errours in doctrine, whereby the sayd religion is corrupted.* D. Morton in his answere to the Protestants Apology lib. 3. cap. 18. sect. 1: *VVe may graunt, that God may cooperate with them to the conuersion of Infidels, so far as the Ghospell of Christ, which is the power of God to saluation, is preached by them.* D. White in defence of his way cap. 38: *In the substantiall points*

Sacramentaries.

Essentiall foundation.

Principall grounds of fayth.

The fundamentall points.

English Protestants

The main points.

The necessary heads.

The ghospell of saluation.

of fayth, we agree with them. Lastly D. Hall in his forelayd booke fayth, that the Romane Church is one touching the common principles of fayth. Those things which the holdeth together with vs, make a Church. As farre as she holdeth the foundation, she is a church. The substantiall articles.

3. Thirdly, the same point is proued, by that they graunt some to be saints, whom they acknowledge also to haue liued and died Papists. For of S. Bernards holines thus writeth Luther vpon the 4. cap. to the Galathians: *Bernard a man so holy, pious, chast, &c.* The Apology of the Confession of Ausburg in the chapter of answere to the Arguments: *Antony, Bernard, Francis, Dominicke, and other holy Fathers.* Brentius in his Apology for the Confession of Wirtenberg pag. 297: *I iudge Bernard to haue byne man indued with great piety, and to liue now happily with Christ.* Caluin in his 4. booke of institutions c. 7. num. 22: *Gregory and Bernard holy men.* Vorstius in Anti-bellarmin pag. 181: *We graunt Bernard indeed to haue byn pious.* Lubbert in his 6. booke of the church c. 7: *We think Bernard to haue byn truly holy.* D. Whitaker cont. 3. quest. 5. c. 14: *I take Bernard to haue byn holy indeed.* And D. Morton in his Apology part. 2. lib. 2. c. 23: *I confesse Bernard was a Saint.* And as plainly do they confesse that he was a Papist. For thus Luther in the place now cited: *Let vs imagine that Religion and discipline of the ancient Popery to flourish now, and to be obserued with that rigour, with which the Eremits, Hieromes, Augustins, Bernards, Francis, and many others obserued it.* And in his booke of abrogating Masse: *Bernard, Benauenture, Francis, Dominicke, with their followers, not knowing the Pope, did honour his Kingdome; beleiuing all things thereof to be good and iust, and of God.* The Magdeburgians in their 12. Century col. 1637. speake thus of him: *He worshipped the God of Mauzim* (they meane the masse) *till the last mo-*

That they say some Papists be saints. The articles which make a Church.

went of his life. And in the next columne: *He was a most eager defender of the seat of Antichrist.* Melanchton in his booke of the Church, and vpon the 14. cap. to the Romanes: *He yelded to many errours, as to the Abuses of the Masse, to the Popes power, to vowes, to the worship of Saints.* Danæus in his controuerties, pag. 313. sayth: *He approued the Popery.* M. Iewell in his defence of the Apology 21. art. diuis. 8 pag. 450: *Bernard was a monck, and liuing in a tyme of such corruption, and being caryed with the tempest and violence of the same, must &c.* Bale in his 2. century of writers pag. 177: *He increased the authority of the bishop of Rome, as much as he could.* D. Feild vpon the 14. of S. Matthew: *Bernard was deceiued with the errour of Peters superiority.* And D. Whitaker in his answere to the 7. reason of Father Campians *Bernard, whome alone your Church in many yeares hath brought forth a holy man.* And in his 4. controuersy queſt. 2. c. 17. he affirmeth that he endeauoureth to confirme the Popes superiority. Being therefore by the confession of Protestants, he was both an earnest Papist vnto his dying day, for all his life tyme he honoured masse, beleiued the Popes superiority (in which two points Protestants say the essence and soule of a Papist doth consist) and briefly beleiued all things belonging to the Pope to come from God: and also was a very holy man, in his life tyme, and now a blessed Saint in heauen; they must needs confesse, that euen the most vehement Papist may be of the church, because neither true sanctity, nor saluatiō can be found out of the church. Whereunto the Protestants in the late Conference at Ratisbon Sess. 13. say: *If they were truly saints, then their errour was not of that kind which ouerturneth the foundation. For it implieth contradiction, that one should be a true Saint, and yet suffer errour which ouerturneth the ground of sal-*

nation.

tion. In like sort they graunt diuers others to be true saints, and yet with hall Papists, but for breuities sake I will content my selfe with this example of S. Bernard. But I will not omit to say, that they confesse our Christian forefathers before Luthers tyme to haue byn Papists, from the top to the toe, from the first to the last, as shall be shewed in the 2. booke cap. 3. and notwithstanding dare not say, that they be damned, yea confesse them to be saued. Luther in his booke of priuate masse enquireth, what is to be thought of our auncestors who haue founded innumerable Masses; and answereth: *I cannot tell certainly.* But vpon the 41. cap. of Genesis, he sayth: *Doubtlesse many haue byn saued vnder Popery.* And vpon the 5. of S. Matthew: *Neither do we condemne the Christians who liued vnder the Pope.* Brentius in the preface of his Recognition: *We doubt not, but that many haue obtayned true saluation in Popery.* Ofiander in his Manual englished: *We do not condemne our godly ancestors who liued in tyme of Popery.* Zuinglius in his actes of disputation fol. 638: *It is impious to pronounce our ancestors to be damned.* D. Morton in his Apology part. 1. l. 1. c. 90: *Be this impiety far from vs, to adiudge our ancestours, to damnation.* And D. White in his defence pag. 356: *I neuer deemed the church of Rome to be the visible church of God, wherein our ancestors possessed the true faith and were saued.* But how could our Popish ancestors be not damned, how could they be saued, vnles they were in the true church, out of which euen Protestants themselues confesse, that there is no saluation, but only damnation. Our Popish forefathers saued. that they confesse true misson and Pastors in Popery.

4. Fourthly I proue that Protestants cannot deny Papists to be of the true Church, because they oftentymes both by word and deed acknowledge the vocation and Mission of Popish Fathers, to

be

be lawfull and sufficient to make a true Pastour of the Church. Luther vpon the 5. cap. of S. Matthew: *We confesse that amongst Papists are pulpits, Baptisme, Sacraments, and all other things belonging to Apostolicall vocation and function.* And in his booke of priuate masse: *There remaineth in Popery Vocation, Ordination, Ministery of the word, and keyes to bind and loose.* Againe: *Christ hath conserued his Ministery vnder Popery.* And as is before cited: *There is all Christian good in Popery, the keyes, the charge of preaching &c.* Iohn Regius in considerat. Censuræ pag. 93: *although it be true that the Popish ministery was depraued with sundry traditions and deuises of men, yet had it those things which were necessary to saluation.* Ruetr in Rom. 8. pag. 427. telling vs by what authority and right he preached Protestantisme, sayth: *I had by lawfull meanes already attayned the charge to preach Christ, and so teach those things which he commanded.* Iunius lib. singulari de eccles. cap. 17: *God calleth the church wherein Popery raigneth, by his spirit, by his word, by the publike instrument of that holy marriage, by the ministery, by sacred affaires & actions. On Gods part these things are apparant in that church.* Plesty lib. de Eccles. cap. 11. p. 361. *The vocation (of our men) is the same that they (the Papists) boast of.* Pag. 362: *Our aduersaries and our first ministers had the same Ecclesiasticall calling.* Boysseul in confutat. Sponderi pag. 486: *It is no reproach for our Pastors to haue issued out of yours; or, as you say, to haue had their vocation from yours.* Moulins lib. 1. de vocat. cap. 5. pag. 20. endeauouring to vphold the calling of their first Reformers, sayth: *They haue that calling which is ordinary in the church of Rome* Pa. 21: *They had their calling of the Pope.* cap. 9. pag. 36: *They haue the same ordinary calling which our aduersaries haue.* And lib. 2. tract. 1. cap. 1. pag. 172: *The calling they had in the church of Rome, sufficed to bind them to preach.* And pag. 173: *Their commission was no other then the ordinary*

ordinary charge. Serenus to delen. Grad. infallib. cap. 2. pag. 31. *We ought not to thinke, that in the church of Rome ecclesiastical ministery is decayed.* And pag. 331 *I like not their frowardnes, who acknowledge no ministery in the church of Rome, but deeme all that is there, diuelish.* Ibid: *Beza doth exagitate Popish orders ouer much, wherein I feare least he preiudice a good cause.* D. Whitaker contr. 4. quæst. 5. cap. 3. pag. 682: *The Papists haue some sort of ministery, and some preaching of the word, which doubtles auaileth many to saluation.* And other where (as is before cited) *Among the Papists there are the keyes, the office of preaching, &c.* M. Bell in his first booke of the Popes funerall cap. 5. affirmeth that he had reiected only the accidents of his Popish orders, but retayned the substance still. M. Mason in his 5. booke of the ordination of ministers, cap. 12. sayth, that Popish ordination consistes of two parts, to wit, of power to offer sacrifice, & of power to administer the word and Sacraments, and albeit he reiecteth the former, yet the later he approues, as that *wherein true ministery consisteth*. Sadeel respon. ad artic. abiurat. 61. And Vorstius in Anti-bellarmin pag. 177. teach the same; and so must all others do, who hold the mission of Luther and their first ministers to haue byn ordinary, and receiued from the Papists: which opinion most Protestants do now follow, retracting, vpon better aduise their former assertion, & confessing that the mission of their new Reformers, was not in substance extraordinary. And their deeds and actions do no lesse declare their approbation and esteeme of the mission and Pastorall charge which is in the church of Rome. Ferus Turrian reporteth lib. 2. de Eccles. cap. 3. and Luther intimateth tom. 2. epist. ad Bohemos, when the Catholike Bishops giue orders, the Hussites of Bohemia steale

steale in priuily among the rest. The Lutherans also made sute to the estats of the Empire, that their ministers might receiue orders from the bishops of Misnia and Numburg. And in artic. 10. Smalcald. they professe thus: *If the bishops (of the church of Rome) would truly execute their office, and looke carefully to the church and word of God, it might be permitted them to giue orders vnto vs and our preachers.* You may adde hereunto, that neither Luther nor any Reformer else euer sought other ordination, then what they had receiued of Papists; and that in the beginning of Queene Elizabeths raigne, the supposed Prelates earnestly besought a Catholike Bishop to consecrate them. And euen to this day, if any renegate Priest ioyne himselfe to the Protestants, they order him not anew, but deeme him fit for their ministeriall function, by vertue of the orders he receiued of Papists. Now if Papists haue true Mission, true pastorall charge, and true Pastors, surely they haue also the true church; it being impossible, that the church should be seuered frō the true Pastours; or that the keyes of heauen which are in the true Pastours hands, should be out of the church, or that the power to remit sinnes, the prerogatiue of true Pastours, shold be where the church is not. Nay, the Protestants themselues confesse as much. Luther tom. 4. in cap. 4. Oseæ fol. 295: *True it is, that the Ministery is only in the Church.* Melanchton tom. 1. Lutheri disput de Eccles. Polit. fol. 483: *The ordination of Ministers is one of the peculiar gifts of the Church.* Caluin lib. de necess. reform. Eccles. pag. 57: *This one reason is as good as thousands, that who so hath shewed himselfe an enemy to true doctrine, hath lost all authority in the Church.* D. Whitaker ad demonstrat 18. Sanderi: *Out of the Church there is no other seate but the seat of errour, of pestilence,*

True mission and Pastors inseparable frō the Church.

and

and everlasting destruction. The same teacheth Sadeel ad Sophism. Turrian loc. 19. D. Feild in his 1. books of the church cap. 14. and others.

5. Fiftly it is euident by the doctrine of the Sacramentaries, who hold that the children of Papists are in the couenant of God, and estate of saluation, through the fayth of their parents; and may therefore be baptised: much more then must they teach, that the parents themselues are for their owne fayth in the couenant of God and estate of saluation; which could not be, were they not in the Church. The antecedent is manifest by the saying of many Protestants. For thus writeth Luther lib. de capt. Babylon. tom. 2. fol. 77: *Here I say that which all say, that infants are holpen by the fayth of them which offer them.* Caluin in his Catechisme cap. de lege: *God extendeth his bounty so farre vnto the faythfull, that for their sake he is good to their children, not only blessing their affaires in this world, but also sanctifying their soules, that they may be accounted of his flock.* Contr. Seruetum. pag. 601: *We think, that there will be vse of Baptisme vntill this promise, I will be thy God and of thy seed, be apprehended by fayth; but euery one apprehendeth it not only to himselfe, but also to his issue.* Beza part. 2. Respon. ad acta Montisbel. pag. 118: *Parents through Gods grace do apprehend grace by true fayth, according to the forme of the Couenant, as well to their posterity as to themselues.* Which he oftentymes repeateth. And likewise in Confes. cap. 4. sect. 48. and cap. 5. sect. 9. and pag. 126. M. Perkins de Sacramento Baptismi tom. 1. col. 846: *Others say, that the fayth of the Parents is also the fayth of their children, all the tyme of their infancy or childhood, and that because parents do by their fayth apprehend the promise both for themselues and for their children: Which opinion seemeth to me the surest of all.* The like he sayth in cap. 3. Galat. The sequele likewise

Papists children saued by the fayth of their parents.

wiseth vndoubted. For if the fayth of Popish parents be of force to establish their very children in the Couenant of God and estate of saluation, though it reside not in them, nor be their act; much more doth it establish the parents themselues, who haue that fayth in them, and whose act it is. Nor do the instances D. Morton brings against it in his answere to the Protestants Apology, lib. 4. cap. 6. make any thing to the purpose; as that in case of necessity an hereticall Priest or Schismatike may absolue from sinnes; and an Infidell administer Baptisme. Against That if such as were free of a citty and are araigned of treason, should haue issue after their condemnation, their children neuertheles shall enioy the title and right of cittizens, whereof their parents were destitute. These examples (I say) are not to the purpose; because he, who is eyther baptized by an Infidell, or absolued by an hereticall Priest, enters not into the couenant of God and estate of saluation for ought that is in the person which baptizeth or absolueth him, but for the Sacrament of Baptisme or Pennance, which he receiueth indeed by the others administration, but hath it in himselfe. And the sonne of a traytor is not made a Cittizen, in regard of any thing that is in the father alone, but for his owne birth which appertaines to himselfe, though his Father be author thereof. But the Sacramentaries teach, that the child of a Papist is in the couenant of God and estate of saluation, not for his owne fayth (for they say he hath none) but for the beliefe of his father; which is no way possible, if the same fayth be not of force to worke the like effect in the father himselfe; seeing it belongs farre more to him, then to his child, and therefore must sooner giue him interest

terest in the covenant, then the child that is descended of him. For how can the fathers beliefe lay hold on the promises and covenant of God for his children, and cannot do it for himselfe?

6. These allegations demonstrate, that by the Confession of the Protestants, the starkest Papists (such as are of beliefe that the masse, the Popes primacy, and all things else of his are good, vpright and of God) *are soldiers vnder Christ, may attaine to salvation, may be Saints; yea that there are among them both many and great Saints. That there is in the Church of Rome what so is necessary to salvation, the summe of fayth, the ground-work: the essentiall ground-worke, the principall grounds of fayth, the cheife articles, the fundamentall heads, the necessary heads, the cheife parts, the Ghospell of salvation, the kernell of Christianity, and all Christian good.* Lastly that the Church of Rome, *Is a limme and member of the vniversall Church, of the Catholike Church, a member of the true Church, and is of the family of Iesus Christ; that it is mother to the children of God, that it is the Church of God, the temple of God, the body of Christ, the Spouse of Christ, that it abides yet in the covenant, is not yet cast of, or put away, is not yet killed, but is yet alive.* Which words plainly import that the Roman or Popish Church is a true Church in the sight of God. The summe of Protestants Confession touching Papists.

7. But is it credible, that such as make profession of Christian religion, should mount to that height of impiety, as dare to reiect & divorce themselues, from that Church which they confesse remaynes yet in the covenant of God, & which Christ hath not yet reiected? Is it credible, that they feare not to impugne, to make bitter invectiues, to disgorge curses and execrations against her, whom they acknowledge to be their Mother, which bore them to Christ, to be the Church of God, to be the body Note.

and Espouse of Christ? What can be more lewd and impious, then to rage and raile against their owne mother, against the Church of God, against the very body and Espouse of Christ? What strang and monstrous blindnes is it, not to perceiue, that whiles they confesse the church of Rome to be the church of God & Espouse of Christ, they acknowledge their owne to be the Synagogue of Antichrist and strumpet of the Diuell? For Christ cannot haue two Espouses, repugnant each to other. Now the Protestant church and church of Rome are parts so opposite, as can neuer make one. For they iarre and disagree mainely in diuers weighty points, as namely touching the canon and expositon of the Scripture, touching sacrifice and the Sacraments, touching the worship of God, & his Saints; touching the meanes to obtaine remission of sinnes, and many the like. Whereupon Beza in Confes. cap. 7. pag. 56: *VVe dissent* (sayth he) *from the Papists, about they very summe of saluation.* And others say no lesse, as shall be shewed hereafter in the 2. booke and 6. cap: *If ours be true Religion* (sayth S. Augustin to the Donatists which yet came neare to Catholiks then Protestants do) *yours is superstition.* Againe: *If our communion be the Church of Christ, yours is not Christs Church; for that is but one, which so euer it be.* And in another place: *VVhen they approue that Church, which (as is manifest) we communicate with all, and they do not; by that their testimony they acknowledge themselues conuinced, and giue you plaine notice (if you be wise) what you ought to forgoe, and what it behoues you to cleaue to and retaine.* And S. Cyprian epistle 76: *If the Church were on Nouatus side, it was not with Cornelius.*

Lib. 2. cōt. Gaud. c. 11.

Lib. 1. de Bapt. c. 11.

Lib. ad Donat. post. collat.

Num. 4. 8. The Protestants now and then perceiue as much, when they acertaine vs (as hath byn shewed in

in the first chapter) that who so seuereth himselfe from any particuler congregation, which is a true Church, excludes himselfe wholy from the church. Caluin saw it, when 4. Instit. c. 2. §. 10. he wrote thus: *We cannot graunt them (Papists) that they are the church, but the necessity of subiectiō & obedience will befall vs. If they be churches, the power of the keyes is in their possession. If they be churches, that promise of Christ: Whatsoeuer ye binde on earth shall be bound in heauen, takes effect in them.* M. Perkins perceiued it to, when in his explicatiō of the Creed col. 794. he sayd: *As long as any church forsakes not Christ, we may not withdraw our selues from it.* The reason is apparant, because in so doing we should depart from Christ, or Christ should be parted, euen as we are rent and disioynted from the church wherein he is. And in his Reformed Catholike tract. 22. col. 470. Where he sayth: *We ought not to deuide our selues from any nation or people, which hath not before cut it selfe of from Christ.* D. Feild likewise saw it in his 3. booke of the Church c. 47. Where he makes this acknowledgement: *Surely if he can proue that we confesse it* (the Church of Rome) *to be the true Church, he needeth not vse any other argument.* But we haue clearely proued it by sundry plaine confessions of many famous Protestants. And hitherto we haue discouered how they sometyme harbour and receiue Papists into their church: now we will shew that they vse the like curtesy towards the rest.

Zanchius lib. 1. de Eccl. c. 7.

CHAP. III.

That Protestants acknowledge for members of their Church, sometyme those that deny as well fundamentall as other articles of their fayth; sometymes Heretiks, Schismatiks, yea their profest and sworne enemies.

THAT they esteeme all such to be members of their Church, as swarue from the Christian fayth only in points not fundamentall, themselues in the preface of the Switzers Confession declare in these words: *Mutuall consent and agreement in the principall points of doctrine, in orthodoxe sense, and brotherly charity, was of religious antiquity thought abundantly sufficient.* And D. Whitaker cont. 4. quest. 1. c. 2. pag. 527: *God forbid that they should be no longer of the number of the faythfull, who are in some points of a contrary opinion, so they assent in the cheife and principall and necessary matters.* And for as much as the Protestants opinion herein is well knowne (for who it is obiected vnto them, that their churches disagree in points of fayth, this serues them for excuse) I think it needlesse to alleage any more of their sayings. He that will may looke the Confession of Saxony cap. de Eccles. Luther tom. 7. lib. de nor. Eccles. fol. 149. Melanthon tom. 4. in ca. 3. 1. Cor. Kemnitius 1. part. Examinis tit. de bonis operibus pag. 332. Zuinglius tom. 1. in Prefat. lib. de Prouident. Caluin. 4. Institut. cap. 1. 4. 12. and cap. 2. 4. 1. Beza epist. 2. Zanchius in prefat. lib. de natura Dei. Hospin. part. 1. Histor. lib. 1. cap. 2. Vorstius in Anti-bellarmin. pag. 116. and others moe. And as their iudgements are differen[t] touching

touching the fundamentall articles of fayth, so in determining, who are to be accounted members of their Church their opinions are vnlike. Some of thē say, that the summe, the cheife and principall heads of fayth, and all things necessary to be believed are comprized in the Apostles Creed. *The principall heads of fayth* (fayth Caluin 2. Institut. c. 16. 4. 8) *are set downe in the Creed.* And it is (as D. Whitaker sayth lib. 3. de Scriptura cap. 3. sect. 1.) *a list of the cheife heads of fayth. It containes* (fayth M. Perkins in his Reformed Catholik col. 476.) *all points of Religion which we are necessarily to believe.* Hemingius in Syntagmate pag. 196: *It containes the ground-work of the whole frame of Religion.* Vrsinus in Cathechesi: *The summe of those things which the Ghospell proposeth vnto vs to believe, that we may be partakers of Gods covenant, is comprehended in the Apostles Creed.* Pareus lib. 1. de Iustificat. cap. 9. hath these words: *In the Creed is layd open the summe of that doctrine, which we must believe to salvation.* The same teacheth Luther tom. 7. in Symbol. fol. 138. Confessio Palatina in initio, prefat. Syntagmat. Confes. the French Catechisme, Brentius in Prolegomenis, pag. 244. The Catechisme of Heidelberg part. 2. Bullinger in compendio fidei lib. 6. cap. 2. and tom. 1. decad. 5. serm. 2. Polanus in Analysi. Catechismi Basle. Boysseul in confutat. Spondei p. 10. Raynolds in Apol. Thes. pag. 241. Carleton in Consensu tract. de Eccles. c. 9. The same is intimated by Zanchius lib. 1. epist. pag. 219. and by Musculus in locis tit. de Eccles. pag. 309. These men then, if the sequele of their doctrine be correspondent to the premises, must needs acknowledge, that the profession of the Apostles Creed, though ioyned with the denyall of whatsoeuer other articles of fayth, sufficeth to make a Protestant, and a limme of their Church.

The Apostles Creed.

And some of them there be who confesse it. For Bullinger lib. cit. cap. 11. fol. 83. sayth: *All that we comprise in the 12. articles, is the true and Christian fayth, vnto which whosoeuer cleaueth, he believeth right, is approued of God, is iustified, and made part ner of euerlasting life.* Caluin cont. Gentil. pag. 659: *The confession of fayth contayned in the Apostles Creed, ought to be inough for all modest Christians.* And Musculus in the place last quoted. *They are wonderfull vnreasonable and vnadui sed, who not content with this belief, exact of the faythfull, that they believe yet other things which are neither mentioned in the Apostles Creed, nor in baptisme.* Aretius in locis part 3. fol. 67: *The articles necessary to salvation are those, which the Creed hath set vs downe. As for the rest, since the matter cannot be decided, variety of iudgements must be borne with all.* Polanus also in the place before cited: *These articles (of the Creed.) if they be vnfaynedly believed suffice to purchase salvation; nor is it required we should believe ought besides.* And Hall in sua Roma irreconcil. sect. 1: *VVe are all one and the same Church, as many as in any part of the earth worship Iesus Christ the only Sonne of God and Saviour of the world, and professe the same common belief comprised in the Creed.*

Beliefe of the Apostles Creed sufficient to saluation.

2. Some of them will haue the grounds of fayth to be contained in the Creed; as Plessy lib. de Eccles. c. 5. Hereupon Marke Antony de Dominis in consil. suæ profect. pag. 18. & 20. sayth: *Restore peace and charity to all Christian Churches, which professe Christ by the essentiall cognisances of belief.* Others ad to the Creed the 4. generall Councels or at least one of them, as D. Andrews in Respons. ad Apol. Bellarmin. cap. 1. pag. 52: *That which is set downe in the Creeds and 4. generall councells, is to vs a sufficient obiect of fayth.* And in Torrian Torti pag. 127: *Nor do we lightly discerne and try heresies other touch-stone, then by examining whether it be repugnant*

The Creeds.

The Creeds & the 4. generall councels.

any of the three ancient Creeds, or 4. ancient generall councells. And Melancthon tom. 3. l. de iudicijs Synodorum fol. 389. sayth of himself, that he is not without the Church, because *he saythfully imbraceth all the articles of the Apostles and Nycen Creed*. Musculus also in the place aboue quoted puts downe this conclusion: *As many as beleeue the Apostles and Athanasius Creed, hold all the Catholike sayth, and are not heretikes but Catholiks*. Some of them are of opinion, that al the fundamental points of beliefe are contayned in the Creed and decalogue; as Melancthon tom. 1. in cap. 7. Matth. pag. 402. tom. 3. in respons. ad artic. Bauar. fol. 363. Vrsinus in Miscellaneis Thes. 8. pag. 114. M. Perkins in his exposition of the Creed col. 789. Some of them say, they are in the Creed, the decalogue, and Lords prayer; as Luther tom. 7. in Enchirid. fol. 118. Beza lib. de notis Eccles. pag. 52. Keckerman lib. 1. System. Theol. 201. D. White in the preface of his way, and in his defence of the same cap. 8. pag. 54. Others reckon the 10. commandements, the Creed, the Lords prayer, & the Sacraments; as D. Whitaker cont. 1. quest. 4. cap. 4. pag. 341. (howbeit quest. 5. cap. 9. pag. 362. he omitteth Sacraments, & putteth in Catechisme in exchaunge.) Vorstius in Antibellarm. pag. 24. vnto which Iesserus lib. de bello Euchar. pag. 40. adioyneth the ministry. And these men according to their seuerall decisions concerning the fundamentall points of beliefe, must with like diuersity require in a limme of the Protestant Church either the beliefe of the Creed alone, and decalogue; or must adde besides (as each think it needfull) the Lords prayer, the Sacraments, the Catechisme, and the Ministery.

The creed and Decalogue.

The creed Decalogue, and Lords prayer.

The creed Decalogue, Lords prayer, & Sacraments. And the Ministry.

3. But sometymes they giue larger scope, & demaund farre lesse, to wit, Baptisme only, or faith

Baptisme and worship of Christ.

in Christ. *Let him let Christianity stand* (saith D. Andrewes in respons. cit. cap. 5. pag. 126) *in baptisme and worship of Christ.* M. Morton in his booke of the Kingdome of Israel and the Church pag. 91: *In what place soeuer any society of men adore true God in Christ, they professe the substance of Christian Religion*: Ierlachius disput. 22. de Eccles. pag. 662: *Where soeuer baptisme remaines entier in regard of its substance, thither reacheth the territory of the Catholike Church*: Againe: *If they acknowledge true baptisme both in ours and in other congregations, they must yeld, that in the same there is likewise the Catholike Church.* And Hutterus in his Analysis of the Confession of Ausburge pag. 525: *As many as are enrolled for Christs soldiers by sacred baptisme, or at least wise are ioyned to him, by profession of fayth, are euery one of them members of the Church simply taken, as it signifieth the company of them that are called.* Serauia defens. contra Bezam cap. 2. pag. 31: *As long as there remained amongst them the new and old testament, together with the Sacrament of baptisme, and beliefe in God the Father, and in the Sonne, and holy Ghost; and they trust to be saued by the Sonne of God and his death; albeit they adioyne a number of their owne wicked forgeries, they are not withstanding parts and members of the vniuersall Church.* The ministers of the scattered Church of the Netherlands in sua narrat. pag. 71: *No man can, not ought to giue sentence in the Church of an others condemnation, of whome it is not publikely knowne, that he is fallen away from the foundation of the Apostolicall Confession, vttered by the mouth of Peter.* Oecolampadius epist. ad Bucerum apud Hospin. part. 2. Histor. fol. 112: *We are gladly at peace with all those that confesse with vs and teach Iesus Christ true God and true man in vnity of person.* And Bucerus apud eundem fol. 84: *We so preach the same Christ with vs, we account them ours, what estimate soeuer they make of vs.* Beza de lib. notis Eccles. pag. 30: *We say it is a true*

Baptisme alone.

Luther de Notis Eccl. fol. 150.

Profession of Christ.

Profession of Christ God and man.

distinction of the true Church, whether generally considered or in particuler, wherein it is sayd to be a company which acknowledgeth one Saviour. For (sayth he) this alone is the only ground-work of that spirituall house of God; Christ Iesus is the seale of that mysticall body, the only rule and square of that building. And the Confession of Bohemia artic. 8. defines the Catholike Church to be all Christians, That are associated in one beliefe concerning Christ and the holy Trinity. The Confession of Basle artic. 5. hath this assertion: We believe the holy Christian Church &c. Wherein all those are Citizens, that confesse Iesus to be Christ, the lambe of God which taketh away the sinnes of the world, and shew openly the same beliefe by works of charity. Acontius l. 3. Stratagem. Satanæ pag. 119. concludes that nothing else is necessarily to be believed, but That there is one God and Christ his Sonne made man and raised from the dead; and that salvation is purchased by his name, and not by any other name, nor by the works of the law. And Luther vpon the 7. of Math. fol. 86. closeth vp all with this epilogue: The head and summe of Christian doctrine is this: that God sent and gave his Sonne, by whome alone he pardoneth our offences, and doth iustify and save vs. This (sayth he) and nothing else, it behoves thee firmely to believe. Sometyme to believe their article of iustification by only fayth is as much as they require in a limme of their Church, or think needfull to salvation. Luther tom. 7. tract. in 3. symbol. fol. 140: I have found by experience, that who so have truly and sincerely believed that principall article of Christian fayth concerning Iesus Christ, though they had their errours and faults, have at last notwithstanding bynsaved. And tom. 4. in cap. 42. Isaiæ fol. 178: If we abide in this article, we are secure from heresies, and retaine remission of sinnes; which pardoneth our weaknes in civill dueties and beliefe. And in cap. 43. fol. 100: Who so believeth this article, is out of danger for ever falling into

To acknowledge one Saviour.

The faith of Christ and the Trinity.

Beliefe of one God & Christ.

That God saveth by Christ.

The only article of iustification sufficeth.

Parens in 1. Galat. lect. 8. Iegler, de bello Euch. fol. 77.

error, and the holy Ghost must needs assist him. And Brocard vpon the 2. cap. of the Apocalips fol. 45 : *The former Ministers who were before the first councell of Trent, determined, that we ought not to contend, but that their Supper should be common, which had receined one doctrine touching iustification.* Caluin de vera Eccles. reform. pag. 316. writeth thus: *I know it is the common saying of a great many, that so the doctrine of vndeserued Iustification continue sound, we should not be so stifly contentious about the rest.* And the Author of the Preface in Syntagma Confess. after he had affirmed that the article of iustification is the ground work, the forme and soule of Christian religion, makes this demaund: *How can they then but haue peace one with another, who soeuer are fellow-partners of so great good?* And he saith, it is, *An vnseemly and heinous thing, that betweene such there should be emnity and debate.* And indeed all Protestants should teach so, since they make this article the definition, the summe, and very soule of Protestantisme, as shall be herrafter shewed in the 6. chapter. Sometymes in a member of their Church, they require only some one point of Christianity, or but the profession of Christs name. For Sturmius apud Hospin. in Coreord. discord. c. 24. testifieth that Bucer sayd: *He would neuer condemne any one, in whome he saw any point of Christianity.* And Plessy lib. de Eccles. cap. 2. affirmeth that the Church may be infected with heresy from top to toe, & yet be a part of the vniuersall Church, *as long as it professeth the name of Christ.* And Moulins in his buckler of fayth pag. 43. *The vniuersall visible Church is the company of all them who professe themselues to be Christians.* Thus we see, that to *a member of the visible Church, yea to fayth, to Christianity, to a member of the true and Catholike Church, to eternall saluation*; as Protestants sometyme iudge and determine) litle or nothing sufficeth.

Any point of Christianity.

Do

Do not these men go about to expose the Church & meanes of saluation vnto scorne and mockery? What Iew or Turke did euer make his Synagogue so common?

Protestits challenge those that deny eus fundamentall articles.

4. Albeit the former allegations do sufficiently conuince, that when Protestants calculate the limmes and members of their Church, they take, to make vp the number, such as renounce the very fundamentall articles of their belicfe; yet to make it more euident, and to preuent all colour of doubt, I will adde other proofes besides. And first we haue in this behalfe their owne Confessions. For Beza lib. de Notis Eccles. pag. 45. teacheth plainly, that *some errours euen in some fundamentall heads of fayth, may creep into the Catholike Church*. And D. Whitaker cont. 2. quest. 4. cap. 3. pag. 490: *It is manifest, that the true Church may erre for a tyme euen in necessary points*. The like hath Hutterus in Analysi Confessionis Augustanæ pag. 453. and Iunius doth intimate as much lib. 3. de Eccles. cap. 17. D. Whitaker against cont. 2. quest. 5 cap. 17: *We gather, that the Church may for a tyme swarue from the truth euen in some fundamentall points, and be notwithstanding safe*. And Zanchius lib. 1. epist. pag. 221. will not haue vs forsake any cõpany on occasion of false opinions, *which swarue from the groundwork of fayth*. D. Hall likewise in sua Roma irreconc. sect. 1. fayth, that the true Church may foster such errours, *As by deduction and consequence destroy the foundations of beliefe*. D. Fulke in his serm. vpõ the Apocalips, hauing made this obiection to himselfe, that seing the Church is the Espouse of Christ, it cannot be, that he suffered it to be possessed so many ages with damnable errors; answeares it in this manner: *What? Christ himselfe hath sayd: that the errors of false Prophets should be exceeding great, in as much as the very elect,*

elect, if it might be, should be led into errour. And lib. de Succes. Eccles. pag. 122. he sayth: *It seemes not fitting to take from the Grecians the name of a Church*; whome notwithstanding he confesseth to be ensnared with grieuous errors. Now a grieuous errour (according to D. Whitaker cont. 2. quest 4. cap. 1.) *dissolues the foundation, and may therfore be termed fundamentall.* M. Perkins in his exposition of the Creed, col. 790: *Whensoeuer an errour is repugnant to the foundation, either directly or by necessary consequence if it proceed of weakenes, he in whome it is, ought to be reputed a member of the vniuersall Church.* And vpon 1. Galat. v. 2: *If a Church through frailty fall into errour, although it concerne the foundation, notwithstanding it remaynes yet a Church, as is certaine by the example of the Galathians.* And vpon the epistle of Iude v. 19: *The Church of Galatia through weakenesse remoued it selfe vnto another Ghospell, and erred in the foundation, yet Paul writeth to it as to the Church of God.* D. Willet affirmeth the same in his Synopsis cont. 2. q. 3. pag. 104. And Melanchton tom. 2. lib. de Eccl. pag. 123. toucheth the same string when he sayth: *The true Church it selfe may haue errours which obscure and darken the articles of fayth.* And tom. 4. in cap. 9. Rom: *God gathereth alwayes some company, in which the foundation is kept, sometymes lesse pure, sometymes more.* D. White in his way pag. 111: *Some articles lying in the very foundation may be beleeued not so clearly.* Nay sometymes they dare auouch, that those very Corinthians that denyed the resurrection, and those Galatians also that changed the Ghospell of Christ into another Ghospell, were of the Church. For thus the Switzers Confession c. 17: *We are not ignorant, what manner of Churches those of the Corinthians and Galathians were in the Apostles tyme: which the Apostle accuseth of many and grieuous crimes, and yet termeth them the holy Churches of Christ.* And Caluin 4. Institut. cap. 1.

Luther. in 2. cap. Galat. fol 123. Perkins loc. cit.

cap. 1. §. 27: *Most grieuous sinnes possesse sometymes whole Churches. The Apostasy of the Galathians was no small offence; the Corinthians were lesse excusable then they; how beit neither of them are excluded from the Lords mercy.* Sadeel in his answere ad Thes. Posnan. cap. 12. pag. 866: *The Galathians and Corinthians, though corrupted with errors, and disagreeing each from other about the cheife ground-work of beliefe, and that not concerning the manner but touching the matter it selfe, retained notwithstanding the name of a true Church.* And hence he gathereth, that the debate and disagreement betweene the Lutherans and Caluinists concerning the Eucharist, doth not let either of them from being of the true Church.

5. The deeds of the Lutherans and Sacramentaries yeld vs a second kind of proofe. For the Electorall or milde Lutherans in colloq. Aldeburg. scripto 8. call themselues, *Fellowes and companions of the same Ministery, fellow-citizens and fellow-soldiers* of those of Saxony or rigorous Lutherans: of whome notwithstanding scripto 6. pag. 111. they giue this censure: *They haue shewed themselues to dissent from our Churches in the foundation.* Againe: *We will make it euident, that they impugne the fundamentall doctrine.* And scripto 4. pag. 4: *Our opinion is, that we disagree not about impertinent matters only, or things of no consequence; but about the maine and cheifest matters.* And scripto 7: *This one thing they ayme at, and bend all their endeauours to vndermine and ouerturne the ground-work of saning doctrine.* And pag. 374. they complaine that those of Saxony *do often cry out of them, that they are worse then any idolaters.* And the Sacramentaries in Præfat. Apologet. Orthodoxi consensus, write thus of the Lutherans: *They haue hitherto suffered among them, such as call in question the doctrine of iustification, of originall sinne, of free will, of the Ghospell, of the law and vse thereof, of Christs* Lutherans professe that themselues differ fundamentally.

descent

descent into hell, of his person, of the election of Gods children, and many other articles of no small moment; which things they easily put vp, because all these go vnder the name of Lutheran. Now that the Sacramentaries likewise acknowledg the Lutherans for their brethren, is apparent by the Apology of the Church of England, by the consent of Poland, by the preface of the Syntagme of Confessions, by the Conferences of Marspurg and Montbelgard, and other publike writings and registred acts: and yet they see and openly exclaime against their errours in fundamental points of fayth. Of Luther thus writeth Zuinglius tom. 2. Resp. ad Luther. fol. 401: *VVe iudge thee a worse seductour, impostour, and denyer of Christ, then was Marcion himselfe.* And fol. 430. *Luther as yet, is entangled and sticks fast in two errours exceeding grieuous, and in most foule ignorance.* Of Melanchon thus sayth Caluin epist. 183: *Either he openly impugneth true doctrine in the cheifest heads, or else hideth his meaning craftily or not very honestly.* And epist. 179. he complaineth that Melanchon endeauoureth to ouerthrow his doctrine of predestination: *VVithout which* (sayth he) *the knowledge of Gods free and vndeserued mercy is vtterly lost.* The like he sayth, epist. 141. Sturmius lib. de Ratione inundæ Concordiæ, sayth plainly, that the Lutherans *do pluck vp the foundation of Christian Religion.* And Bullinger in fundamento firmo writeth, that *the very infidelity of the Iewes and Gentils is by the Lutherans brought into the Churches.* Cureus in Exegesi Sacramentaria pag. 91: *Surely the controuersy* (between the Lutherans and Sacramentaries) *is concerning the foundation.* The Sacramentaries in the Preface of the Conference at Mulbrun say, that the Lutherans. *Teare in peeces and adulterate the articles of the incarnation, of the true humane nature &c. VVhich articles* (say they) *no Christian man can doubt*

Sacramentaries challenge Lutherans.

And yet say they differ fundamentally from the.

doubt but are the groundwork of saluation. And in the foresayd pretace: *They are at variance, not about the Lords supper only, but touching the person of Christ, touching the vnion of his diuine and humane nature, touching the vbiquity of his body and corporall manducation thereof common both to good and bad, touching his ascending vp to heauen, and his sitting at the right hand of his Father: of all these points they contend, and that with such exceeding heat of disputation, as that old heresies not a few, long since abolished and condemned, begin againe to lift vp their head, as if they were recalled from hell.* The like they haue ibidem in Prolegomenis. Of the controuersy which is betweene the Lutherans & Sacramentaries about the reall presence of Christs body in the Eucharist, Martyr in locis tom. 2. p. 156. gines this iudgement: *The contention and difference there in concernes the cheife heads of Religion.* Caluin epist. 292. sayth, that the opinion of the Lutherans doth, *By mischeiuous inglings and legierdemains ouerturne the principles of sayth.* Beza in his 5. epist. that it *destroyeth the verity of Christs body.* And epist. 81. that it *recalleth from hell the folly and doting errours of Marcion and Eutiches.* Bucer cited by Hospin. part. 2. Hist. fol. 84: *It followeth thereupon, that Christ is not true man.* Paræus in cap. 3. Galat. lection. 37: *There is nothing more directly opposite to Christian Religion, then to think that the body of Christ doth indeed lye hid really vnder the bread, and that the same is truly eaten with the mouth.* Sadeel. in tract. de Coniunctione &c. pag. 369. that it *ouerthroweth the true nature of the true body and blood of Christ. Which thing (sayth he) we still lay to their charge.* And tract. de Sacramentali manducatione pag. 26. that it is *a word of exile* pag. 267: *That it traines after it idolatry.* And pag. 268: that it *cannot stand with the verity of Christs body.* Hospin. part. 2. citat. fol. 2. that it *is the foundation of Papistry.* And fol. 281: *The base and pillar which sustaineth all the whole blended*

and

and disordered heape of abuses, and all the bread-worship which hath vnder the Popedome byn deuised and brought in. Lauaterus lib. de diffid. Euchar. fol. 7. that it is the *Foundation of the Popedome*. Cureus in Spongia, that *it is the foundation, the strength, the throne of the God Mauzim, and of the Popish state*. And Vrsinus in Catechism. quest. 78. cap. 3. sayth: *As long as the opinion of the corporall presence is maintained, Popish adoration, and oblation, and the whole Popish masse is kept on foot*. And there is not one Sacramentary, but thinks the verity of Christs body, and his ascension, & sitting at the right hand of the Father cleane taken away, if he should say he were substantially in the Eucharist. Whereupon Zanchius tom. 1. Miscell. in iudicio de diffidio Cœnæ pag. 553. sayth: *There are two maine reasons why the one party* (to wit the Sacramentaries) *renounce the presence of the body: The one, that the article of Christs ascension into heauen may be kept entire: the other that the nature and verity of his humane body be not destroyed*. Nay some of the Sacramentaries in their Confessions of faith condemne the opinion of the Lutherans as mad and blasphemous. For Confess. Crengerina cap. de cœna Domini, sayth: *We condemne their madnes, who auouch and maintaine flesh-eating, that is, who hold, that Christs naturall and very body, raw and bloudy without any change or transubstantiation at all, is receiued with the very mouth*. And the Scots in their Confess. pag. 159. say they, *Detest that blasphemous opinion, which auoucheth Christs reall presence in the bread & wine, and that he is receiued by the wicked or taken into the belly*. This and much more of the like is sometymes the Sacramentaries plea against the reall presence of Christs body in the Eucharist: and yet at other tymes they professe that this controuersy is not of so great weight and moment, as that it should dissolue Ecclesiasticall Communion a-

Caluin de Cœna p. 2. & in Cōf. pag. 754. Beza in fo. 6. v. 23. 62. & ad 4. Demonstr. Illyrici. Zanchius in Confess. c. 16. sect. 12.

fellowship. For so teacheth Martir apud Simlerum in vita eius, the author of the orthodoxe Consent. Prefat. Apologet. Hospinian part. 2. Histor. fol. 78. Caluin de scandalis pag. 95. In Consens. p. 764. Beza lib. de cœna cont. Westphalum. pag. 258. M. Perkins in his exposition of the Creed, col. 792. and others. Nay (as we sayd before) these men beseught the Lutherans, who stedfastly maintaine the reall presence, to hold them for brethren and members of their Church. They can then find in their conscience to haue fellowship and Communion with those men, whose doctrine they condemne, *As Frantike & blasphemous; whose doctrine* (they say) *destroyeth Christs ascension and the verity of his humane nature; subuerteth the principles of* kind of *fayth and cheifest points of religion; yea alleth the doting follies of* men Sa. *Marcion and Eutyches, establisheth the Kingdome of Antichrist* craments. *traines after it idolatry and a world of euills.* Fy on these me beliete, who think the maintenance of an opinion, which (as themselues professe) ouerthroweth the principall articles of Christian fayth, draweth after it idolatry, and most foule heresies, layeth the foundation whereon Antichristianity is raised; of so sleight consequence as it ought not to dissolue fraternity and Communion. What regard of fayth or saluation may we think these men haue? There is yet another point of Luteranisme touching the vbiquity, or presence of Christs body euery where reproued of the Sacramentaries, and held in extreme dislike; of which they likewise exclaime: *that it is forged and composed of Eutychianisme and Nestorianisme: that the heresies of* (b) *Marcion and Eutyches, yea well nigh* (c) *all old heresies are by it raised againe from hell; that it subuerteth the whole* (d) *Creed; that it takes away the* (e) *cheife heads of Christian Religion; & that there is scant any one article of Christian beliefe*

Rich. Mu. Sa. What
(a) Beza respons. ad acta mompelg. colloq. pag. 252.
(b) Caluin. Institut. c. 17. p. 17.
(c) Hospin. part. 2. hist. fol. 78.
(d) Perkins exposit. Symb. col. 792.
(e) Sadeel. de verit. num. 108.

beliefe which it doth not vtterly abolish. And yet these selfe same Sacramentaries stile them who defend this opinion (f) *Most flourishing Churches*; and made earnest sute to be held for (g) brethren of those very men, who vpheld this doctrine against them, and maintayned it to their face. Nay the particuler Churches of Sacramentaries themselues consist of parts mainly disioyned in matters of beliefe. Examples hereof we need not seeke abroad. Our owne Protestants tell vs, how the Puritans their brethren allow not of the booke of common prayer, but *hold it to be full of* (a) *corruptions and all abominations*, and teach that Protestants (b) *wickedly mangle and wrest the Scriptures, that they haue no* (c) *Pastours, that they haue not a true Church, yea not so much as the outward face of a Church*; *and that they exhort the Court of Parlament with perfect* (d) *hatred to detest the present state of the Church*; *that no* (e) *Iew, no Turke, no Papist, could possibly haue spoken more spitefully of their Church and state, and that they seeke to shake, nay to ouerthrow the* (f) *foundations, grounds, and pillars of their Church.* Finally, that the Puritans *will not account the Protestants their* (g) *brethren*, and yet the Protestants nevertheless acknowledge Puritans for *their* (h) *brethren and fellow-labourers in the Lords haruest.* In Scotland likewise (as his Maiesty witnesseth) *That which was Catechistically doctrine in one assembly, was hardly admitted for sound and orthodoxe in another*; and yet these assemblies excluded not one another from the Church. What can be therefore more cleare and euident, then that both the Lutherans and Sacramentaries acknowledge (when they list) those to be members of their Church, who deny fundamentall articles of their fayth?

Sacramentaries say there is fundamentall difference amōg them.

(f) *Sadeel. Iup.*
(g) *Bezain colloq. mōtisbel. pag. 402.*
(a) *Whitgift. resp. ad Admonit. p. 149. 257.*
(b) *Ib. resp. ad schedas.*
(c) *Resp. cit. pag. 6.*
(d) *Pag. 32.*
(e) *Pag. 33*
(f) *Pag. 6.*
(g) *Resp. ad schedas. Bancrofts sureyc. 33*
(h) *Resp. ad schedas Oxon. resp. ad Millen. Confer. ad Hampton Court. p. 84.*

6. A third proofe may be drawne from the Protestants demeanour and carriage towards the Fathers,

Fathers, whome they claime and challenge for their fellow-cittizens, and yet confesse plainly (to omit what they acknowledge concerning other points) that they were of a contrary beliefe in the article of Iustification by sole fayth; wherein (as shall be here after shewed) they say the soule, the summe, and definition of Protestantisme consisteth. Luther tom. 1. colloq. German. apud Coccium tom. 1. pag. 131: *In which errour* (that works ioyned with fayth do iustify) *were many of the Fathers.* And tom. 5. in cap. 3 Galat. fol. 358. he sayth, that of the difference, which he espied between the law and the Ghospell, as that the law taught iustification by works, the Ghospell by sole beliefe, *There is nothing to be found in the works of the old Fathers. Augustin held it in part, Hieronme and the rest knew it not.* Melanchthon tom. 1. in Dominicam Trinitatis pag. 89: *It is meruaile, that the cheife Doctours had no knowledge of the iustice of fayth.* Tom. 2. lib. de Eccles. pag. 134: *Chrysostome reckons vp many wayes and meanes to obtaine remission of sinnes, as almes deeds, teares, and other works.* The Centuriatours of Magdeburg. cent. 3. cap. 4. col. 79. & seqq. say, that the Doctours of the third age *Make workes the cause of our iustice in Gods sight.* Cent. 4. c. 4. col. 293: *In this article of iustification this age reuolted wholy from the doctrine of the Apostles.* And Cent. 5. in Prefat. they say of the Fathers of that age: Chrysostome and the residue *attribute iustice vnto works, they make works the meanes of salnation, and ascribe iustification either in part, or formally, or wholly vnto works.* Gerlachius tom. 2. disput. 13: *The ancient Fathers would haue the iustice, life, and salnation of a Christian man consist in obseruing Gods commaundements, as Hilary, Origen, Tertullian, Eusebius, Chrysostome, Augustine, &c.* Kemnitius in locis part 1. tit. de Iustificat. pag. 242. sayth that the Fathers *Intermingled sometymes*

Protestãts say the fathers dissent fundamẽtally from thẽ. In the art. of iustification by only faith.

times and enterwyned the doctrine of good workes with the article of iustification, sometymes plied and bended the article of iustification to good workes. And part. 2. tit. de lege pag. 106: If the Fathers disputes be all layd together, the summe of them is this in effect, that sinne and infirmity of nature is manifested by the law, to the end we may search out a Phisitian, by whose grace it may be so healed, as it be able to satisfy and fulfill the law, and so we be saued. And ibidem in orat. de lectione Patrum pag. 3. he sayth of S. Cyprian, He had a fundamentall error. And pag. 4. of S. Hilary: He held an erroneous opinion touching the foundation. Caluin also lib. cont. Versipellem pag. 353: Three maine points of our fayth, to wit, the corruption of our nature, free and vndeserued iustification, and Christs Priesthood, are so darkly and obscurely touched in the ancientest writers, that no certainty can be drawne thence. Againe: We shall neuer learne by the Fathers, how we may be reconciled to God, how the obedience of Christ is freely and vndeservedly reputed ours. Martyr in locis cit. de scriptura col. 1431: Other Fathers think good workes much auaileable to iustification. Hospin. in epist. dedicat. part. 1. Histor: All the Fathers well nigh do now and then sprinkle and cast on with all the leauen of good workes, and attribute iustification to them, either in part, or formally or wholy. Pareus lib. 4. de Iustificat. c. 11: The Fathers both Greek and Latin especially those that were before the Pelagian bickerings, fancied ouer much, and tooke to great a liking to the Philosophers doctrine, concerning the iustification of workes. Finally M. Perkins in Problem. cap. de Iustificat. sayth, that the old writers confound the law with the Ghospell, and do not distinguish the iustice of the law from the iustice of the Ghospell.

the sume of the fathers doctrine is iustification by works.

7. To them, who in this manner ioyne friendship and Communion as well with such as renounce fundamentall articles of fayth, as with those whose beliefe is contrary in articles not fundamental, who

meruaile is it, if all heretiks and Schismatiks seeme fit companions, and worthy to be accounted their brethren and fellow-cittizens? But let vs heare their owne words, wherein they acquaint vs, what ranke heretiks & Schismatiks hold amongst them. Luther tom. 7. serm. de Dominica 20. post Trinit. fol. 262. sayth: *They are frantique and beside themselues who go about to seuer the Church corporally from heretikes.* Hemingius in Syntag. Institut. pag. 192: *In the outward society of the Church, are many heretiks and Schismatiks.* Salomon Gesner in locis loc. 24: *Are heretiks then in the Church? By any meanes.* Brentius in Præfat. Recognit: *Christ giues not ouer the conseruation of his sheep in the middest of heresies, but they must be such, as do not quite take away the foundation and Ministery.* Reineccius tom. 4 Armatur. cap. 6. pag. 35: *We affirme there are heretiques euen in the true Church.* Hutterus in Analysi Confess. August. pag. 435: *Neither were heresies without the territory and limits of the true Church.* Plesly in his booke of the Church cap. 2. affirmeth plainly, that *all heretical and Schismatical congregations are truly the Church.* And ibid. pag. 25. he sayth: *Although particuler Churches be infected with heresies, from top to toe, neuertheless they are parts of the vniuersall Church as long as they professe the name of Christ.* Moulins in his Bukler of fayth part. 1. sect. 89: *An heretical Church may be sayd to be a true Church, euen as man blemished with a canker or infected with the plague is notwithstanding a true man.* Sonis Respons. ad Spondeum c. 10. pag. 365. *Heretiks are within the Church.* Lubbert lib. 2. de Eccles. cap. 3: *It is manifest, that heretikes are, some as yet in the visible Church, some also in the church of the elect.* Iunius lib. 3. de Eccles. cap. 4: *Heretiks absolutely are of the Church, vnlesse they be such as ouerthrow fundamentall articles of religion.* Bullinger teacheth the same Decad. 2. serm. 8. and it is the common doctrine of Cap. 5.

the Protestants, who (as is before proued) exclude none from being members of their Church, that deny only such articles as are not fundamentall. How beit some of them *vpon heretical priuiledge* (as Tertullian speaketh) will not haue such called heretiks; being indeed more ashamed of the name then of the thing it selfe. Zanchius likewise lib. 1. epist. ad Dodit. pag. 150. sayth, that *heretical and Schismatical sects are within the Church.* Tilenus in Syntag. disput. 14: *Heretiks euen those that subuert the foundation, and Schismatiks in regard of outward Communion, are in the Church, till either of themselues they go to the enemies side, or are cast out by the lawfull iudgement of the Church.* And D. Feild in his first booke of the Church cap. 14: *Seing God gaue the power of the keyes and the dispensation of his word and Sacraments only to his Church, if Heretiks be not of the Church, they do not then baptize.* And cap. 7: *They that are partakers of the heauenly calling, and sanctified by the profession of diuine truth, and the vse of the meanes of saluation, are of very diuers sortes; as heretikes, Schismatiks, hypocrites, and those that professe the whole sauing truth in vnity and sincerity of a good and sanctified heart. All these are partakers of the heauenly calling, and sanctified by the profession of truth, and consequently are all in some degree and sort of that society of men, whome God calleth out vnto himselfe, & separateth from Infidels, which is rightlynamed the Church.* D. Whitaker contr. 4. quest. 5. c. 3. pag. 679: *All heretiks are within the Church.* Hooker in his 3. booke of Ecclesiasticall policy pag. 128: *We must acknowledge euen heretikes themselues to be, though a maymed part, yet a part of a visible Church:* Againe: *If an Infidell should pursue to death an heretike professing Christianity only for Christian Profession sake, could we deny vnto him the honour of Martyrdome?* By which words it is plaine, that they admit heretiks not only into the visible

Lib. de carne Christi, cap. 15.

Church

Church, but into the inuisible also, or company of the elect and predestinate to saluation. And D. Andrewes in his answere to Bellarmines Apology cap. 5. pag. 121, denyeth that the words, *Catholik* and *Heretike* are opposite; wherefore vnlesse he will debarre and shut out some Catholiks from the Church, he must needs giue admittance to heretiks, seing by his owne verdict they may be Catholiks. D. White in defence of his way cap. 38. pag. 367: *The second sort of the militant Church are hypocrites and vnsound members, that are not called effectually, but disobey the truth whereof they make profession, such are heretiks, schismatiks &c.* Touching their acceptations of Schismatiks, besides what hath byn already alleaged, D. Feild in his first booke of the Church cap. 13. writeth thus: *The departure of Schismatiks is not such, but that, notwithstanding their schisme, they are and remaine parts of the Church of God.* Iunius in the place before quoted layeth clayme to those Schismatikes, *Who* (sayth he) *seuer not themselues from the whole Church but only from a part thereof.* But D. Morton in the 1. part of his Apology lib. 1. cap. 2. sayth absolutely without any acception or restraint at all: *Schismatiks are of the Church.* And lib. 2. cap. 10. pag. 388: *Variances* (sayth he) *and schismes do not betoken the false Church.* And D. Willet in his Synopsis cont. 2. quest. 3. pag. 104: *We say that Schismatiks, though they hold some false points of doctrine, yet if their errours be not fundamentall, and if they retaine the purity of doctrine in all points necessary to saluation, and the administration of the Sacraments, may make a particuler Church by themselues.* These are their acknowledgements touching Heretikes and Schismatikes in generall. Let vs now descend to particularities, and see the courteous admission they giue to some of them by name.

They challenge Schismatiks.

They acknowledge the Grecians.

8. The Grecians and other Easterne Schismatiks,

matiks, yea heretiks to, for the most part, find that fauour at their hands, as they vouchsafe to account them members of their Church. His Maiesty epist. ad Card. Peron pa. 13 hath thus: *The Churches of Rome, Greece, Antioch, Aegipt, Aethiopia, Muscouy, and others most are members of the Catholike church.* D. White in defence of his way c. 37. pag. 355: *The visible churches of Greece, Aethiope, Armenia, and Rome, with the nations contayned therin, haue in them the true church of God, wherin men may be saued.* D. Morton in his answere to the Protestants Apology lib. 4. cap. 2. sect. 7. sayth, that the Assyrian Churches keep the true foundation of Christian fayth. The same, (especially of the Grecians) teacheth Luther tom. 2. lib. de captiu. Babylon. fol. 65. & in Assert. art. 37. fol. 114. Iunius cont. 4 lib. 4. cap. 6. Sadeel. Respons. ad Thes. Posnan. cap. 12. D. Whitaker lib. 7. cont. Duræum sect. 3. Bucanus loco 41. quæst. 5 D. Feild lib. 3. de Eccles. cap. 5. & 28. D. Fulke de Success. pag. 120. Burhill pro Tortura Torti c. 15. and others.

They challenge the Anabaptists.

9. And sometymes they are not lesse free-hartted towards westerne heretiks. Melanchthon in locis à Manlio editis tit. de Eccles. pag. 491. writeth, that two girles, who were burnt (as he sayth) for Anabaptisme, *held the foundation of fayth, and died in a good Confession.* And Zuinglius tom. 2. lib. de Author. sedit. fol. 134. & seq. exhorting his fellowers, not to reuolt from his doctrine, for the debates and quarels betweene the Protestants and the Anabaptists, calleth both parts *most learned and somnes of the same Father. Neither must thou* (sayth he) *giue any man way to shake and weaken thy fayth, although thou see that men of the greatest learning moue disputes, and fall by the eares with much eagernesse of contention, touching externall matters* (he meanes baptisme)

but let this be rather thy stedfast perswasion, that by the Sonne of God we are all made sonnes of the same Father. Againe: Neither am I wont to speake these things, for that I am so greatly moued with the baptisme of children. And ibidem lib. de Baptismo fol. 96. he sayth, that baptisme *is a matter of ceremony, which the church may omit or take quite away.* Oecolampadius in his 2. booke of epistles p. 363. sayth, baptisme *is an externall thing, which by the law of charity may be dispensed withall.* And Musculus in locis tit. de hæreti pag. 605. reckons the Anabaptists amongst those, *who* (sayth he) *keeping the foundations of fayth, about secondary matters haue fallen into misbeleefe.* And Bucanus loc. 41. de Eccles. quest. 5. auoucheth plainly, that Anabaptists are a Church, *Like as a man attainted with leprosy or out of his wits, is a man.* His Maiesty epist. ad Card. Peron pag. 25. sayth: *Some reckon baptisme among those things, which whether we haue or want, the matter is not great.* And D. Whitaker cont. 4. quest. 7. cap. 2. pag. 716. sayth we may abstaine from baptisme, so there be no contept and scandall in the fact. Finally D. Morton in his answere to the Protestants Apology lib. 4. albeit in the 6. chapter he make a doubt whether Anabaptists retaine and hold the foundation, yet in the 2. cap. sect. 10. speaketh thus: *The Anabaptists exclude Protestants and all different professions from the hope of spirituall life, yet do not Protestants iudge the state of euery Anabaptist to be so vtterly desperate.* We see how they teach that Anabaptists *hold the foundation, and deny but an externall, secondary, and ceremoniall matter, and such as may be omitted, so it be don without scandall; that Anabaptists and themselues are sonnes of the same Father, that they are in the state of saluation, and that they are a church as a man tainted with leprosy is a man.* Now concerning the Arrians of these tymes, M. Morton in his booke of the Kingdome of Israel, and the Church

And the Arrians,

pag. 94. auoucheth plainly, that their Churches are to be accounted the Churches of God, *Because* (sayth he) *they hold the foundation of the Ghospell.* Hooker in his 4. booke of Ecclesiasticall policy pag. 181. writeth thus: *The Arians in the reformed churches of Poland &c.* Nay some of the Protestants lay clayme to that old heretike Aërius, for that he agreed with them in denyall of prayer for the dead, and some other points; yet that he was stained with Arianisme, S. Epiphanius, who liued in those tymes hær. 75. and S. Augustin 53. (witnesses whole credit herein can no way be impeached) do plainly testify.

Danæus in 0.53. Aug. de hæref. VVhitak. ad Rat. 10. pag. 241. Parentius in Instruct Gall. p. 27.

They lay claime to their professed enimies.

10. Lastly they forbeare not sometymes to challenge for their owne, such as were their profest enemies, as is certaine by their clayme to the Papists and Grecians, who condemned and branded their doctrine with the marck of heresy. And the Sacramentaries pretend a right to Luther and the Lutherans, howbeit it is well known, that both the Master and the sect haue diuers tymes censured and condemned their doctrine by name, as in the Confessions of Auspurg, Mansfeld, Antwerpe, & that of Sueueland set forth anno 1563. in the booke of Concord, in the visitation of Saxony, and else where it appeareth. And that in the Conference of Marpurge and Montbelgard they gaue them the repulse and flatly refused to admit them for brethren. Nay, as Lauatherus writeth lib. de dissid. Euchar. anno 1556: *There haue byn many Synodes held* (by the Lutherans) *wherein they consulted what way they might take to quell and make an end of the Sacramentaries.* And they shew the same encroaching desire in personall Claimes. For Illyricus in his Catalogue lib. 19. col. 1917, enrolleth amongst his witnesses Clichthouæus, an earnest and vehement aduer-

In Concil. Trid. In Censura Orient.

sary

fary both of Luther and Oecolampadius. D. Humfrey in vita Iuelli claymeth Erasmus, for a maintayner and Champion of the truth. M. Fox vouchafes him a place in his kalender of Protestant Saints, and Verheiden sets his pourtraiture amongst the Worthies and Pairs of their religion. Vorstius in Append. Respons. ad Sladum pag. 136. accounteth him one of his owne, *that is* (sayth he) *one of the reformed.* D. Whitaker Contr. 4. quest. 5. cap. 3. pag. 693 sayth: *It is most apparent that Erasmus thought the same of religion that we do.* And yet Erasmus himselfe lib. 16. epist. 11. professeth, that he acknowledgeth not Luther, and impugneth openly both him and his doctrine. And (as Amsdorfius writeth in epist. apud Lutherum tom. 2. fol. 487.): *The summe of Erasmus doctrine is this, that Luthers doctrine is heresy.* Otho Brunsfelsius in his answere to Erasmus spunge, layth these things to his charge: *Thou makest protestation neuer to haue conuersation or fellowship with those men, who imbrace the ghospell vnder Luthers name.* Againe: *It is well knowne and confest, that of so many enemies of the* (Protestant) *ghospell, no one euer did it more harme then thou.* Hutterus in Expostulat. Hospin. part. 2. Histor. fol. 72. Iames Andrew lib. cont. Hosium p. 110. D. Iames l. de corrupt. scripturæ & Patrum pag. 66. and others, say the like of him. D. Humphrey ad Rat. 3. Campiani will haue King Henry 8. to haue byn a member of their Church. D. Fulke lib. cont. Heskins. & Sander. sect. 82. sayth, *he was a member of the Catholike church of Christ.* And D. Andrews in Resp. ad Apoll. Bellarm. cap. 1. sayth: *He was a true defender of the true sayth.* Bucer epist. dedicat. Comment. ad Rom: *He imbraced the pure Ghospell of Christ reiecting those forgeries of men which are repugnant to it.* And yet, it is most certaine, that he sharply persecuted and pursued Protestants

Rainolds l. 1. de Idolat. cap. 2.

stants euen vnto death. And as Melanct hon writeth to him in epist. tom. 4: *He oppressed the truth then appearing and shewing it selfe*. And as Cambden sayth in Apparatu Annalium Anglic. *Protestants be burnt for heretikes.* Of Charles 5. Scultetus in Conc. secular. pag. 10. writeth thus: *It is knowne by vndoubted demonstration, that Charles 5. departed this life trusting to the same comfort and the same sayth, which Luther drew from the sacred wellsprings, and broached to the people.* (Iames Andrews lib. cont. Hosium pag. 233. hath the like) and yet in the same sermon p. 27. he sayth: *To this alone he bent his whole endeauours, that he might pluck vp the Lutheran religion by the rootes.* M Done in his booke of Recusancy will needs persuade vs, that Bellarmine himselfe is a Protestant, or at least no right Papist. What meruaile is it, if these men be so hardy as to challenge the ancient Fathers, seing they are not ashamed to claime in this manner their professed enemies, such as are knowne to all the world, and are yet aliue.

That Protestants sometymes acknowledge Idolaters, Infidels, Antichrist himselfe, and Atheists to be members of their Church.

CHAP. IV.

Protestits challenge Idolaters.

1. THAT they sometymes confesse idolaters are members of their Church, is euident. First for that they refuse not to receiue Papists, (as we haue heard before) in exclamations and outcries against whose idolatry, their tongues and pennes are set most a worke, for to their worship of the Eucharist, of Saincts, of images, of reliques, they afford no milder

milder name. And secondly it appeareth by their owne words. For M. Hooker in his 3. booke of Ecclesiasticall Policy pag. 126. sayth: *Christians by externall profession they are all, whose marke of recognisance hath in it those things which we have mentioned; yea although they be impious idolaters, wicked heretikes, persons excommunicable.* Againe: *Those whose knees were bowed vnto Baal, euen they were also of the visible Church of God.* Boysseul in Contut. p. 822 answering to the place where Spondeus obiected that if the Church of Rome be an Idolatresse, (as Boysseul had auouched) it is not the Church of Christ; makes this reply: *And why not as well as Israel?* And D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 3. cap. 3. pag. 475. saith: *Although this errour* (Idolatry in adoring the calfe) *were most grieuous, yet it destroyed not the whole nature of the Church.*

2. That they sometimes comprize also Infidels in the Church, is manifest, first because they affirme that such may be saued; For M. Fox in his Martyrologe pag. 495. reporteth that a certaine Protestant Martyr whose learning piety & zeale he greatly commendeth, taught *that a Turke, Saracen, or any Mahumetan what soeuer may be saued; if he trust in one God and keep his law.* M. Bale in his 6. Century pag. 464. bids vs beware *that we condemne not rashly any Turke.* And Zuinglius tom. 1. lib. de prouid. fol. 370. sayth: *It is not vniuersally true, that who so hath no fayth is damned.* Againe: *As for the damnation of vnbelieuers it is meant only of those, who heard and did not beleeue.* And tom. 2. declarat. de peccat. orig. fol. 118: *This saying* (who so doth not beleeue shall be condemned) *must in no wise be absolutely vnderstood, but it is to be vnderstood of those, who hauing heard the ghospell would not beleeue.* And ibidem in expos. fidei fol. 559. he sayth, that in heauen Christians shall meet many heathens, And Infidells; See Wotton in Speculum Controu. 87.

heathens, whose names he there sets downe, and amongst the rest that cruel Theseus, and Magician Numa, the founder of heathenish superstitions amongst the Romans. Which opinion of his those of Zurich in Apolog. Gualter. in prefat. tom. 1. Zuinglij, Simler. in vita Bullengeri, and others seeke to patronize and make good. Now it were folly and madnes, to auouch that these men were of the number of the faythfull. They believe then that infidels may be saued. But S. Augustin was of a farre different belefe lib. 4. cont. Iul. cap. 3. where he writes thus: *VVhat one of those, who would be accounted Christians, will say an Infidell is iust, be it euen Fabritius.*

3. Secondly their doctrine touching the predestinate carrieth with it a necessary acknowledgement of their Commnnion with Infidels. For they teach, that who so is predestinate is alwayes a member of the Church. Hus his first article condemned by the Councel of Constance was this: *The predestinate remayneth euer a member of the Church.* And Luther tom. 2. in Assert. art. 30: *I say the opinions of Iohn Hus are all Euangelicall and Christian.* Againe: *I admit all the condemned articles of Iohn Hus.* And tom. 1. in disput. Lypsic. fol. 254. he maintaineth openly this article of Hus: *The Church is the whole multitude of the predestinate.* Vorstius in Anti-bellarmine page 125: *VVe affirme that the Councell of Constance, which condemned the doctrine of Hus* (that who so is predestinate is alwayes a mēber of the Church) *was surely in this respect Antichristian.* Danæus in Resp. ad Bellarm. Contr. 4. lib. 3. cap. 2. (sayth: *The first opinion* (which was the opinion of Hus) *is true, and is ours.* Againe: *our opinion is that the Church is the whole company of men, whome God hath predestinated to salvation.* And cap. 7: *It must be answered that Paul was alwayes* (but not *alwayes apparently*

parently in regard of men) of Gods true Church. Againe: *Such Turkes and Iewes as God hath predeſtinated to ſaluation, are of the Church, euen now at this tyme in regard they are predeſtinate and in reſpect of God; but they are not yet of Gods Church apparently, and in reſpect of vs, for as much as they lack yet thoſe markes, whereby God doth beere shew vs men who are of the church.* And Cont. 4. lib. 3. cap. 12: *The true definition of the true church is this: The company and multitude of thoſe, whome God hath choſen to ſaluation.* And Iunius lib. 3. de Eccleſ. cap. 7: *Paul was alwayes of the church according to predeſtination; from which (ſayth he) the church taketh her being, or formal definition; but not according to the outward forme of the church.* What can be more apparent, then that theſe men teach, that the predeſtinate are members of the church according to the true being therof and in the ſight of God, euen during the tyme of their infidelity.

4. Thirdly this followeth neceſſarily vpon that which they teach concerning infants (eſpecially ſuch as are deſcended from faythfull parents) departing this life vnbaptized. For they affirme, that the children of the faythfull are actually in the Church, as the French Confeſſion article 35: *Togeather with the parents God accounteth alſo their offspring in the church.* And the Zuitzers cap. 20: *VVhy ſhould not they* (the children of the faythfull) *be ingrafted by ſacred baptiſme, who are Gods proper poſſeſſion and within his church?* Caluin in Inſtruct. cont. Anabap. art. 1: *Vnſpotted infants are in the Communion of the church before they come forth of their Mothers wombe.* And Pareus lib. 3. de Iuſtificat cap. 4 pag. 884. *Caluin on good reaſon determineth, that the children of the church, are borne cittizens of the church.* Their doctrine alſo hath the ſame iſſue, who teach that infants (at leaſtwiſe the children of the faythfull) are ſaued

without

without baptisme; as the Protestants in the colloq. Ratisbon. And Zuinglius tom. 2. Declarat. de peccat. orig. fol. 119: *Concerning Christians children we are assured, that they are not damned for original sinn; of others we haue not the like assurance: howbeit, to confesse ingenuously, the opinion we taught heretofore, to wit, that we ought not to iudge rashly of heathens children, seemes to vs the more probable.* Vorstius in Anti-bellarmine pag. 542: *Zuinglius and some other gospellers auouch, that all children whatsoeuer are by the grace of Christ saued; others for the most part hold, that at leastwise all the elect, whether extract from faythfull or other parents do euen vnbaptized attaine to saluation.* Whereof he sayth: *The opinion of these later is surely the safest; and yet the first opinion is probable inough and ought not to be rashly condemned.* Now as D. Whitaker sayth Cont. 2. quest. 1. cap. 5. & 6: *All that are saued are really and actually in the church.* And D. Morton part. 1. Apol. lib. 1. cap. 4: *To be of the church in possibility, sufficeth not to saluation.* Lubbertus lib. 2. de Eccles. cap. 2: *Neither can any one be saued except he be actually and really in the church.* Whence Martyr in 1. Cor. 7. fol. 177. sayth: *Infants must of necessity appertaine vnto the church, seing there is no saluation without it.* They teach moreouer, that Infants haue no fayth, and consequently that they are infidels, whence it ensueth that they account some infidels to be actually of the church. Caluin 4. Institut. cap. 16. §. 19: *I will not lightly affirme, that they (infants) are endued with the same fayth we find in our selues.* And 4. seq. he sayth: *Infants are baptized for future repentance and fayth. Now if they dye before they are of yeares, God reneweth them by the vertue of his spirit, which we do not comprehend, in such manner as himselfe alone knoweth how to bring to passe.* Lib. cont. Seruet. pag. 647. he sayth, that that sentence of the Scripture: *Whosoeuer beleeueth not in the Sonne of God abideth in death, and the wrath of God remayneth*

Infants without all faith according to Protestants.

vpon

vpon him, belongeth not to infants, but only to such as are obstinate. And in cap. 5. Rom. v. 17: That you may be partaker of iustice, it is needfull that you be faythfull, because it vnreteined by fayth. To infants it is communicated by a speciall manner. Bucer in cap. 19. Matthæi pag. 404: Paul sayth that fayth commeth by hearing the word preached, and in the same sort all the Scripture speaketh of fayth. Seing therefore infants heare not the word preached, they cannot haue this kind of fayth. But out of that, that infants want fayth, nothing lesse can be concluded, then (which some thinke) that therefore they cannot please God. Infants are blessed by the grace of God and merits of Christ. But if they be taken hence in their infancy, they shall know God and reape felicity by some other knowledge then fayth. Musculus in locis tit. de baptismo: Infants haue yet no fayth. Againe: Infants are saued by Gods election, though they be taken out of this life not only vnbaptized, but euen before they haue fayth. Beza in Confess. cap. 4. sect. 48: It doth not appeare to vs that infants are endowed with that habit of fayth, which we sayd was required to the receiuing of the matter and effect of the Sacraments, nor is it likely that they are. And in colloq. Montisbel. pag. 407: Wherefore, though the children of the faythfull want fayth, yet is not baptisme vnprofitable to them. And part. 2. Respons. ad acta Montisbel. pag. 124: All elect infants haue no fayth of their owne, especially actuall; yet rightly are they baptized according to the forme of the Couenant, I will be thy God, and of thy seed, which is apprehended by the parents to themselues and their children. And pag. 129: I confesse that fayth is required, that infants comprehended in the Couenant may please God; but I deny, that they can or ought to be endowed with their owne fayth inherent in them. Danæus l. 4. de baptismo cap. 10. pag. 268. proposeth to himselfe this question: What is the fayth which in baptisme we require in infants? and answereth: None. Vrsinus in defens. argument. Bezæ. God receiueth infants into the Church with-

Infants haue not so much as the habit of fayth.

ont sayth. Peter Martyr in 1. Cor. 7. pag. 94: *Seing the holy Scripture doth not tell me, that infants believe, or those miracles are wrought in them, neither see I that it is necessary for their saluation, I think it is inough that they be thought to be saued, because by election and predestination they belong to the people of God, & are endued with the holy Ghost, who is the author of sayth, hope, and Charity. Perhaps they will answeare out of Augustins opinion, that they are saued by the sayth of others, to wit of their parents. But the Prophet sayth that euery one is saued by his owne sayth, not by other mens sayth. Wherefore we answere more easily, who exact expresse and actuall sayth in those that are of yeares, but in the children of Christians, who are brought to be Christened, we say sayth is begun in its principle & root, because they haue the holy Ghost firm wisance all both sayth and other vertues do flow.* D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 6. c. 3. pag. 566: *Baptisme doth not infuse any sayth or grace into infants.* And he sayth plainly, that infants *haue no sayth.* And lib. 1. cont. Duræum sect. 77: *albeit in the Sacraments sayth which receiueth the word of promise, be necessary, yet that sayth is not needfull in infants, albeit it be not to be doubted but the holy Ghost effectually worketh in them after a secret and wonderful manner.* M. Perkins de prædestinat. tom. 1. col. 149: *Infants which dye in the Couenant, we believe to be saued by reason of that Couenant, but they were not chosen for sayth or according to sayth, which yet they had not.* And in serie causar. cap. 25: *Elected infants dying in the wombe or soone after they be borne, are saued after a hidden and vnspeakeable manner ingrafted in Christ by the spirit of God.* Luther tom. 6. in cap. 25. Gen. fol. 322: *Vnbaptized infants haue no sayth.* Melancthon in locis tit. de baptismo to. 3. fol. 238: *It is most true, that sayth is required in all that are of years.* But concerning infants (sayth he) the matter is otherwise. Kemnitius part. 2. Exam. tit. de baptism. pag. 89. telleth vs that some Protestants are of opinion, *that infants are in-*

Infants saued without sayth.

tied saued by the grace of God, but without fayth. Nor doth their saying that the seed or root of fayth, or else an inclination or disposition to fayth (which some of them affirme infants to haue) help them any thing at all, both because Scharpe cont. 1. de Iustifi. graunteth that this seed *can neither haue the knowledge nor applying of the promises*, and therefore is not Protestant faith, and because Musculus in loc. is tit. de fide art. 7. confesseth, that they *distinguish and put a difference betweene fayth and this hidden seed.* Now if it be no fayth, it maketh not him fayth full in whome it is. And lastly because (as themselues acknowledge) they are not assuted, whither infants haue any such seed or no. For Caluin lib. 4. cap. 16. § 9. cit: *Whether they haue at all any knowledge like vnto fayth, I choose rather to leaue it vndetermined.* And he addeth, that the manner of their renewing *is knowne to God alone.* To these allegations you may adde, that M. Perkins in his Reformed Catholike cont. 16. sayth, a man may be saued *by a desire to haue fayth*: And neuertheless confesseth that this desire *is not indeed fayth.* And in 2. Galat. col. 91: *God accepteth the will and desire to believe for believe it selfe.* Now as long as a man hath not fayth but only a desire thereof, he is an infidel.

5. You might think, that hauing made this graunt of saluation to infidels, their liberality wold rest here, and not passe these bounds; but they go yet further, and bestow it sometymes euen vpon him, whome they sweare, yea believe as an article of their fayth (and that with as great certainty and assurance as they believe God is in heauen, or Christ is the Messias) to be that notable Antichrist foretold in Scripture. For thus writeth M. Powell lib. de Antichristo cap. 33. pag. 338: *I will in no wise say, that all the* Protestats challenge Antichrist,

Popes from the tyme wherein Papistry was first reuealed to be Antichristianity, are damned. How beit in the beginning of his booke he makes this protestation: *I solemnely take God to record, that I as certainly know the Bishop of Rome to be that great Antichrist, and the Popish church to be the Synagogue of Antichrist, as I know God to be in the heauens, & Iesus Christ to be the true Messias promised to the Fathers.* D. Whitaker likewise cont. 4. q. 5. cap. 3. pag. 694. sayth: *I will cry aloud and sweare by him who liues for euer, that the Bishop of Rome is Antichrist.* And to D. Sanders last demonstration that the Pope is not Antichrist pag. 799: *We may take that most sacred and most true oath, and sweare by him who liues for euer, that the Bishoppe of Rome is the very Antichrist.* And neuertheless in his answere to the first demonstration he sayth with M. Powell: *I will not say, that from the tyme that Papistry began to be Antichristianity, the Popes themselues haue lyn all damned.* And both he cap. cit. pag. 679. & 682. & other Protestants ordinarily affirme that Antichrists Sea shalbe *in the true Church, among the company of the faythfull*, and that he shall be *a citizen, and inhabitant, and Pastour of the Church.* To whom I pray will these men deny saluation, or a place in their Church, who graunt it vnto Antichrist the sworne enemy of Christ, whome the scripture it self styleth: *Christs aduersary, the man of sin, the sonne of perdition?* I see not why they should hencefoward vpbrayd vs with Antichrist, since they themselues clayme him for a member of their Church.

That they challenge Atheists.

6. It is also certaine, that they challenge Atheists. For Illyricus in Catal. lib. 9. col. 1916. D. Humfrey respons. ad Rat. 3. Camp. M. Fox in his Acts printed anno 1596. pag. 646. allot that Atheist Machiauel an honorable roome among the witnesses and maintayners of the truth. And Luther apud Manlium

Manlium in loc. tit. de Eccl. pag. 483. sayth of Valla, *that he gaue place to none but Epicure himselfe, and professed openly, that he held opinions repugnant to the foundation of sayth.* Neuertheless the same Luther respons. ad Louan. & Colen. tom. 2. fol. 38. writeth thus of him: *Valla in my iudgement was either a remanent sparke, or some sewell of the primitiue Church, whose like in constancy and vnfayned zeale of Christian sayth Italy or the whole Church had not for many ages.* One Epicure then in Luthers iudgement was the remanent sparke, and sewell of the Church.

That sometymes Protestants account all those their brethren, who vnder the name of Christians oppose themselues any way against the Pope.

CHAP. V.

1. THAT Protestants sometymes acknowledge all those for members of their Church, who vnder the name of Christians do any way oppose themselues against the Pope, I proue: First because some of them do openly so professe. For (as Kemnice reporteth in locis tit. de Eccles. pag. 122.) *Some faine the Church to be a rable of all Sects, of Anabaptists, Sacramentaries, Swincfeldians, and others, so they be not Papists.* And Capito in Caluin. epist. 6. *Some haue brought in a liberty as if all were of the Gospells side, whosoeuer haue cast of the Popes yoke.* Musculus also in locis tit. de cœna pag. 522. sayth: *I imbrace all for brethren in the Lord, howsoeuer they disagree from me or among themselues, so long as they maintaine not the Popish impiety.* Secondly, because they professe, that

the end of their preaching was to lessen the authority of the Pope, and Bishops, and to be contrary to them. For thus Luther writeth of himselfe epist. ad Frederic. Elect. tom. 2. fol. 330: *The Ecclesiastical tyranny is now weakned and broaken, which only I purposed in writing.* Or as Sleidan lib. 3. reporteth, *He writeth, that the Ecclesiastical tyranny is now weakned, & that, that alone was his desigue at the first.* And epist. ad Waldenses in Holpin. part 2. fol. 8. he sayth, that *he impugned transubstantiation only for enny of the Papists.* And in parua Confess. apud eundem fol. 13. that he impugned the Eleuation *only to spite the Papists.* Caluin 4. Institut. cap. 10. §. 1. sayth: *The end of our contention is, to bridle that infinite and barbarous Dominion, which those, who would be accounted Pastors, haue vsurped ouer soules.* Zuinglius lib. de Auctor. Scdit. tom. 2. fol. 125. affirmeth, that there is a sort of Protestats, *which for no other cause do beare the doctrine of the Ghospell then because they extremely hate the Popedome, and enuy Papists their felicity and glory.* Bucer lib. de regno Christi cap. 4: *The greatest part of men seeme to haue sought only the sat things of the ghospell. First that they might shake of the tyranny of the Romane Antichrist, and of the false Bishops &c.* Luther also tom. 2. German. fol. 22. telleth what was the end of the Sacramentaries & Anabaptists: *I heare* (sayth he) *that some imbrace Anabaptisme for this only end, that so they may spite the Bishop of Rome, euen as the Sacramentaries do only in hatred of the Romish Bishop, deny that there is any thing in the sacrament beside bread and wine.* Of the new Arians end thus writeth Zuichius lib. 1. epist. pag. 154: *Our Arians haue determined to ouerturne from the foundation whatsoeuer is in the Church of Rome.* And what end Illyricus had, thus telleth D. Whitaker ad Rat. 8. Campiani: *Illyricus went further then he should, as I think to be the further off from you, whome he hated.*

For what end Luther and his fellowes preached.

2. Third-

2. Thirdly, because they call the departure from the Pope and Popish doctrine, *the foundation, a good part, and the summe of the Protestants building*, Sadeel Respons. ad Arthu. cap. 12: *Protestants agree in this foundation, that the Church ought to be reformed out of the word of God, and that Popish errours must be removed out of the Church.* Serauia epist. dedicat. ad Episc. Angliæ: *It is to be wondered, how much almost all the Reformers please themselues in this point that they will haue nothing common with the church of Rome.* Grotius apud Homium in Specimine &c. 2 *Neither can I forebeare to shew the fountaine and offspring of this and other calamities; VVe think that we are so much the purer, the further we go from points of Romish doctrine without any difference.* Vergerius dial. 1. pag. 20: *VVe hope, that shortly all matters will be composed. VVe could do, by Gods helpe, that which seemed the cheifest of all and the hardest and well nigh impossible, that is, pull our selues and ridde vs of the Papisti tyranny. VVherefore nothing is to be doubted, but we shall compasse other matters of lesse moment. For a good foundation is layd, yea a good part of the building is set vp.* And Zuinglius Respons. ad Billi. tom. 2. fol. 261. When one obiected vnto him the dissention amongst the Sacramentaries in expoũding Christs words of the supper, answereth: *No man ought to be offended with this diuersity, more then with the difference among many captaines, who go about to conquer a castle, whiles one would haue it battered, another vndermined, and a third would haue it scaled. For all agree to destroy the castle, the difference is only about the way, not about the summe of the matter.* And so concludeth, that if any Sacramẽtaries haue erred, *They erred* (sayth he) *in the letter not in spirit, in the summe they agree all.* The summe therefore wherein all Protestants agree, is to ouerthrow the Popish castle, and Catholike fayth, (in which also the ancient heretikes agreed amongst themselues as

Tertull. præs. c. 42. Athanas. orat. 1. cõt. Arian. Hieron. ad Ctesiphont. August. in Psal. 80. Beda l. 1. in Iob. c. 7.

the holy Fathers do testify) and who attempteth that by what meanes soeuer, erreth not in spirit, but in letter only, not in the summe but in some circumstance only of Protestácy. But with what spirit they are led herein, let them heare of their owne Prophet Luther, defens. verb. cœnæ tom. 7. f. 411: *What a kind of spirit is that* (sayth he) *which hath no other end, but to weaken the aduerse party? without all doubt it is no other spirit then the Diuell.*

3. Fourthly, because they describe, paint, & name a Protestant by departure from the Pope and Popish doctrine. The Confession of Wittenberg in Prefat. describeth Protestants to be such, *as haue changed in their Churches a kind of* (Popish) *doctrine, which had byn vsed for many yeares, and some other ancient ceremonies.* M. Perkins in the Preface of his Reformed Catholik, sayth: *By a Reformed Catholike* (so he termeth a Protestant) *I vnderstand any one, that holds the same necessary heads of Religion with the Roman Church, yet so as he parts of and reiects all errors in doctrine, whereby the said religion is corrupted.* D. Willet in the Preface of his Synopsis: *A Protestant is he that professeth the ghospell of Iesu Christ, and hath renounced the iurisdiction of the Sea of Rome, and the forced and vnnatural obedience to the Pope.* Schusselburg tom. 13. Catal. Hæret. pag. 23: *A Lutheran or true Christian is he, who hath seuered himselfe from Papists &c.* And tom. 8. pag. 363: *True Lutherans are they who imbrace the doctrine of the ghospell, amending Popish abuses.* You see how in all these descriptions of a Protestant, the denyall of the Pope and Popish doctrine is put as a certaine difference, which concurreth to the making and distinguishing of a Protestant from all others. Hereupon D. Andrews Apol. Cont. Bellarm. cap. 1. sayth: *Sauing this Protestation* (that they will not suffer certaine Popish

errors

errors and abuses) our faith is no other then yours is, or ought to be. And he addeth, that they call their religion reformed, *only because it is purged from certaine deuises and corruptions, which had crept into it.* And sayth, that Bucer and Peter Martyr *did only pluck vp certaine cockle, which Papists had sowed.* In like sort Boyssieul in his Confutation of Spondè pag. 724. sayth: *Take away your Popery & that which dependeth thereof, and you and we shall be but one church, because we shall haue but one Confession of faith.* Moreouer Plessy in the forefront of his mystery of iniquity, painteth a Protestant with a torch in his hand, setting fire to the tower of Babylon, by which he vnderstandeth the Popedome. And finally Luther in exempl. Theol. Papist. tom. 2. fol. 401. calleth himselfe an *Anti-papist*, as of his principall end or office, and sayth, that he was called by diuine reuelation to destroy the Popes Kingdom. D. Humfrey also termeth Ochinus *a stout Anti-papist*, as if to be a Protestant and an Anti-papist were all one.

4. Fiftly, because the same opinions which in Papists they detest, in other who are opposite to the Pope, they dissemble or extenuate. Lubbert. lib. 1. Replicat. cap. 4. sayth: *The Lutherans dispute not with vs about the Canon of Scriptures, nor we with them.* And lib. 4. de Concil. cap. vlt: *We contend not with the Churches of Saxony, which keep images in the Churches.* And yet they dispute most eagerly against Catholiks about the Canon of scriptures, and images. The Scots in their generall Confession professe to detest Popery, for maintayning the reall presence of Christs body in the Eucharist, for making the signe of the Crosse, for denying infants without baptisme to be saued. And in their other Confession c. 22. they say they shunne the

Communion of the Popish Church, because her ministers are not Ministers of Christ, because she permitteth women to christen in case of necessity; and yet dissemble, that the Lutheran Protestants allow all these points; and that the English Protestants admit Popish Priests for sufficient ministers, command the making of the crosse in baptisme, & allow womens baptisme in case of necessity; but because they are against the Pope, as well as the Scots, their opposition to the Pope, like sole fayth covereth all, and maketh that the Scots impute not these matters to them. And if at any tyme the Catholiks do set before their eyes the errors or dissentions amongst them, either they impudently (a) deny them or greatly extenuate them, saying, that *they are not about the* (b) *foundation, not of* (c) *weighty matters, of light matters, not of the* (d) *matter but of the manner, of* (e) *things indifferent, of I know not what titles, and finally only of* (f) *words.* Surely I imagine, as they say, that all sinnes in the elect faythfull are veniall, but in others all are mortall: so they deeme, that all errors in those that are opposite to the Pope are veniall and light; but in Papists all are haynous and mortall. So much the alteration of the person changeth the case with them. Hereupon Q. Elizabeth enacted, not that it should be treason for any one to dissuade frō that religion which she had established, vnlesse it were done with intention to induce him who was dissuaded, to the obedience of the Bishop of Rome. And hereupon also some of them openly professe, that they more esteeme Turks then Papists; forsooth because the Turke agreeth with them in hatred of the Pope and Popery, in respect whereof they little regard the consent in the mysteries of the Trinity, and Incarnation and Pas-

Conf. Augustana vlt. Saxon. Liturgia. Anglica. Conference at Hampt. Court.

(a) Lasko & Erasmus in Schussel. l. 4. Theol. Calvin p. 336. Field l. 3. of the Church cap. 24.

(b) Apol. Anglic.

(c) Whit. Cot. 2 q. 5. cap. 8.

(d) Bucer in Schussel. lib. cit. Calvin de rat. concord. p. 868.

(e) Epist. Monitor.

(f) Mart. in loc. tit. de Euchar. §. 65. Hosp part. 2 fol. 234. 163. 209. Brussfeld. resp. ad Erasm.

son,

sion, and other articles of Christian fayth. Sixtly they make the forsaking of Popery an euident argument of true religion, and oppose their consent therein, as a sufficient cloake to couer all their dissentions in other matters. Zuinglius Prefat. Ecclesiast. tom. 1. fol. 39: *It is an euident argument of true Religion among you, that you cast out all the filth of* (Popish) *idolatry and bridle the sloathfull company of Priests and put them from the Church.* And when Cardinall Hosius obiected to Protestants their disagreement about the Eucharist, Iames Andrews in his answere pag. 367 sayth: *What is this dissention to you Papists? Be it we truly disagree in this point, yet in that we especially agree, that with one mind we impugne your Popery as true Antichristianisme.* And Brentius in the Preface of the same booke: *Otherwise with one consent they fight against Popery.* And to the same obiection Caluin in Confutat. Holland. pag. 576 sayth thus: *True; yet with one consent we all teach, that* (Popish) *idolatry is to be detested.* In like manner Beza in Hospin. part. 2. Hist. fol. 300: *I confesse; yet in this we all agree with vnited minds to impugne your transubstantiation.* Sadeel also Respons. ad Sophism. Turriani pag. 562: *Yet neuertheless this my litle booke will be witnesse with how conioyned strength all our Churches do set vpon the Popish errors.* And in indice Repet. pag. 808: *It is well that all they who conioyned themselues to the reformed Church, with one consent reiect the Popes Primacy.* And D. Whitaker Contr. 2. quest. 5. cap. 8. pag. 521: *Yet in the meane tyme we all agree against the Pope.* And in this vnity of theirs to be against the Pope, they greatly triumph. His maiesty in his monitory epistle p. 174: *Almost the halfe part of the Christian world is gon out of Babylon.* And D. Andrews respons. ad Apol. Bellarm. cap. 14: *Almost halfe of the Christian world is so farre vnited in one profession, as that they are gon out of Babylon.* And when Beza

In what Protestants especially agree.

nus had found fault with him, because he sayd, *The King of great Britany and the Kings of Denmarck and Sweden with the Princes of Germany who are of one beliefe with him, are a part of the Lords flock*; because the Kings of Denmarck and Sweden be Lutherans, and therefore are not of one beliefe, with the King of great Britany; Burhill in defence of him cap. 15. answereth: *That, who are of one beliefe with King James, is put in sted of who with him refuse to be vnder the Pope.* They meane then, that all those are of one beliefe with them, and be part of the Lords flock, who refuse to be vnder the Pope. Which kind of vnity is that, which his Maiesty in his declaration against Vorstius noted Heretiques to keep, saying pag. 49: *There are in Hungery and Bohemia innumerable Heretiks, who agree together only in hatred of the Pope.* But not only Heretiks, but also Iewes, Turcks and Infidells agree with Protestants in this point. An excellent vnity surely, & worthy of Christians, wherein they shall haue such partners and fellowes. Seauenthly I proue it, because when they be asked, who were Protestants before Luther, they produce no other then such as were aduersaries to the Pope. Illyricus being to make a role of witnesses, dares not call them Protestants or witnesses of the Protestant truth, but simply *witnesses of the truth, or witnesses who reclaymed against the Pope and Popish errors.* And in the Preface professeth, that he gathereth, as farre as he cold, all those, who in any sort did before Luther *giue testimony to the truth of Christ against the errors and furies of Antichrist.* And l. 10. col. 1951. after he had brought forth all his witnesses, he sayth of them thus: *They desired a fuller manifestation of the truth, which at last* (sayth he) *we in this sixteenth age haue obtained.* That is, his witnesses attayned not to the knowledge of Protestant truth, which

Illirico Lugdun.

which was reuealed but in the sixteenth age. Neuertheleſſe they ſeemed witneſſes good inough for Illyricus, becauſe in ſome ſort they were oppoſite to the doctrine and deeds of the Pope. Beza alſo lib. de notis Eccleſ. pag. 80. when he had obiected to himſelf, that in former tymes their Church was not viſible, anſwereth: *I ſay, that from the Apoſtles tyme there was ſcarce any age, in which as ſoone as this Antichriſt* (the Pope) *began to put out his head, God did not raiſe ſome, who oppoſed themſelues againſt his tyranny*. And to the ſame queſtion thus anſweareth Sadeel in Refutat. art. 61. Poſnan. pag. 851: *VVe are ready to shew, that there was no age, in which there were not ſome, who reproued your falſe Church*. Surely theſe men imagine Proteſtancy to conſiſt in oppoſition to the Pope and Popery, or they ſay nothing to the queſtion propoſed. Likewiſe D. Whitaker Cont. 2. queſt. 3. cap. 2. pag. 474. proueth, that the Proteſtant Church hath alwayes byn in Popery, becauſe therein haue byn ſome, who *though they communicated with Papiſts, yet before death reiected their opinions*, which kind of proofe ſuppoſeth, that it ſufficeth to a Proteſtant to reiect Popiſh opinions.

5. You ſee then, that the cheife ringleaders of the Proteſtants confeſſe, that theirs and their followers end was to abate the authority of the Pope; that they deeme the forſaking of the Pope to be the foundation, a good part, and ſumme of the Proteſtant building; that they account the leauing of Popery an euident argument of true religion; that they define, deſcribe, paint, and name a Proteſtant by oppoſition to the Pope; that they ſay their faith differeth not from ours, but in denyall of ſome of our articles; that they deny, diſſemble, and extenuate whatſoeuer they diſlike in thoſe, who are aduerſaries

to

to the Pope; that they oppose their consent in opposition against the Pope as a buckler against all obiections about their dissentions in other articles; & finally that being bidden to produce Protestants before Luther, they name such as any way opposed themselues against the Pope. What do all these things declare, but that which some of them say in plaine words, that the Protestant Church is a rable of all sects which are not Papists.

1. What followeth of all hitherto sayd.

6. But out of all things which haue byn sayd in this and the former chapters. First we see, what great power Protestants take to themselues, that according as they please they include, or exclude the same men out of the Church. *VVho will not* (to vse S. Augustins words) *feare these men, who haue receiued such wonderfull power ouer men.* Secondly we see, that they imitate the old heretiks, who (as Tertullian sayth) make *peace generally with all, and with whome diuision is their very vnity.* For (as S. Augustin noteth) *the diuell hath stirred vp heretikes, as if they might be indifferently permitted in the citty of God without amendment, as the citty of confusion indifferently had Philosophers of different, yea of contrary opinions.* Thirdly we see, how infamous a society Protestancy is, into which all heretikes and Schismatikes, likewise Idolaters, Infidels, Antichrist, Atheists, are admitted. What sinke euer did receiue such filth? Surely such a rable deserueth better the name of hell, then of the holy Church. Fourthly we see, how monstruous a company it is which consisteth of so different and opposite members. Fiftly, we may gather, what Protestants meane, when they say Protestants haue byn alwayes, or before Luther. For they meane not, that there haue byn alwayes some, who beleiued at least all their fundamentall articles, but

2. lib. 3. cont. Cresc. c. 20. Præscript. c. 41. 42. l. 18. de Ciuit. c. 50.

3.

4.

5. What they meane by a Protestant in tymspast,

but that there were alwayes some, who (as they speake) *opposed themselues against the Pope or his errors*, whether they were otherwise Schismatiks, Heretiks, infidels, or Atheists. Of which kind of men I deny not but there haue byn alwayes some rable, but none but a mad man will say, that it was the holy Church & spouse of Christ. Sixtly we see how litle Protestants account of their Church, fayth, and religion; and believe nothing lesse then that it is the church of God, or fayth of Christ. For who doubteth, but Schisme, heresy, infidelity, Atheisme, are most pestilent plagues and infernall darknesse directly opposite to ecclesiasticall Communion and fayth, which are the forme, life, & soule of the Church? And who can imagin, that he can associate and vnite together formes so contrary as are light and darknesse, life and death, truth and lies? or that the society in darknesse, lies, and death, as are the societies in Schisme, Heresy, and infidelity, can become one with the society in light, life, & truth, as the Church is? If therfore seriously they believed their Church to be the church of Christ, they would neuer thinke, that she could become one with the society in Schisme, heresy, and infidelity. And this sometymes Protestants themselues perceiue. For Brentius in Appendice Recognit. thus speaketh to the Sacramentaries, when they desired to be held for brethren of the Lutherans, whome yet they condemned of heresy: *If they iudge our opinion to be impious, with what face do they desire to ioyne themselues with that Church which maintayneth impious doctrine, and to be held of her for brethren? VVhat fellowship* (sayth Paul) *is there of iustice with iniustice? or what Comunion of light with darknesse, or what agreement of Christ with Belial? or what for the saythfull with the infidell? VVherefore if they desire this sincerely, and*

6. Note.

in

in earnest, they manifestly shew, that they make mockery of religion, as if it skilled not which one follow, so he may passe his life peaceably and quietly. In like manner those of Wittenberge in their Refutation of the orthodoxall consent pag. 636. say: *We cannot wounder inough, that seing they not only accuse the doctours of our Church of horrible and damned heresies, but also haue long since condemned them, to wit, of Arianisme, Nesterianisme, Eutichianisme, Marcionisme, Manichēisme, and the Monothelites heresies; neuertheless they dare account vs for brethren and desire our brotherhood. Who that is carefull of piety and truth can persuade himself, that these Sectmasters do in earnest handle religion? For if we be such as we are indged of them, our friendship and fraternity is to be detested, not desired.* Thus speake the Lutherans to the Sacramentaries, which no whit lesse falleth vpon themselues, because they also challenge the Hussites and other old heretiks, whome they cannot excuse from
7. holding vile heresies. Finally we see, how vncertaine Protestants be in determing what a Protestant is, and what is necessary to the essence & making of a Protestant; & consequently how vncertaine they must be, whome to hold for one of their houshold, whome for a stranger, whome for a brother, whom for an enemy; which church or company they must imbrace, which they must fly, which they must account the spouse of Christ, which the Synagogue of Satan. Then the which vncertainty nothing can be more miserable in matter of religion. Wherefore sith they are so vncertaine in this matter, we must therin settle some certainty, and that according to their owne principles.

CHAP.

That it is necessary for a Protestant to believe with only speciall fayth that himselfe is iustified.

CHAP. VI.

1. ABOVE all things it is most necessary to an invisible or true Protestant in the sight of God (as they terme him) that with only speciall or peculiar fayth he believe some thing belonging to himselfe, to wit, that he is iustified in Christ, or (as they vse to speake) that with fayth he apprehend Christs iustice, and apply it vnto himself in particuler. And to a visible Protestant in sight of men it is in like sort necessary, that he professe himself to believe with such a fayth that he is iustified in Christ: For example; For Luther to have byn a true Protestant before God, it is needfull that he have truly believed himselfe to be iustified by only the foresayd speciall fayth, which he had of his own iustice; which faith they call speciall or particuler, because it was particuler to Luther, no man being bound to believe Luther to be iustified besides himselfe. And for Luther to have byn a visible Protestant in the sight of men, it was needful in like manner to have professed himselfe to have believed that he was iustified by only the sayd fayth. The same I say of Caluin and of euery Protestant in particuler. That according to their doctrine it is most necessary to a Protestant that he believe himselfe to be iustified by only speciall fayth is manifest. First because they teach, that a man is iustified by only speciall fayth, wherewith he believeth

something belonging to himselfe alone, not by an vniuersall or Catholike fayth whereby he believeth the mysteryes of Christian religion common to all, and which euery one must believe, for this fayth they call historicall, and say it may be in such as are not iust, yea in hipocrites and Deuills. Seing therefore in their opinion no man is a true Protestant in the sight of God, but only he that is iust, nor any iust but who hath a speciall or peculiar fayth wherewith he apprehendeth Christs iustice to himselfe, it is manifest, that according to their principles, none can be a true Protestant before God, vnlesse he haue the foresayd speciall fayth; and in like manner that none can be a visible Protestant before men, vnlesse he professe to believe iustification by only speciall fayth; because none can be accounted to be of any religion, vnlesse he professe to believe those meanes of obtayning iustification and remission of sins, which that religion teacheth. Caluin 3. Instit. cap. 2. §. 16: *None is a true faythfull man, but he, who with a solid perswasion that God loueth him, assureth himselfe of all things from his goodnes &c.* And §. 39. he sayth: *Without this, Christianity standeth not.* And in Rom. 1. v. 7: *Hence we gather, that none do rightly account themselues faythfull, vnlesse they certainly assure themselues that God loueth them.* M. Perkins in his exposition of the Creed col. 780: *No man can believe himselfe to be a member of the Church, vnlesse he firmely and certainly perswaded that he is predestinated to eternall life.* Besides Caluin in his litle Catechisme cap. de fide defineth iustifying fayth, to be *a certaine and stedfast knowledge of our heauenly Fathers goodwill towards vs.* The like definition he hath 3. Instit. cap 2. §. 2. Luther in cap. 4. Ioelis tom. 4. and generally all Lutherans and Sacramentaries, except that where some define it to be a know-

None faythfull without speciall fayth.

What fayth is according to Protestants.

Parem l. 1. de Iustif. cap. 11.

a knowledge, others say it is an assurance or confidence of Gods favour. Hence it is manifest, that they account none a iust or faythfull man, vnlesse he haue a speciall fayth of his iustification and Gods fauour towards him.

2. Secondly I proue the same out of diuers commendations of Protestants touching the necessity and excellency of this article. For Luther tom. 1. in disp. fol. 410. sayth: *In vaine he believeth other articles, who denieth that we are iustified by only fayth.* And tom. 2. lib. cont. Missam fol. 390. he sayth, that this article *is the summe of his doctrine and Ghospell.* And lib. de votis fol. 278. that this *is the definition of a Christian, who believeth to be iustified by the only works of Christ alone, without his owne.* Tom 3. in Psalm. Grad. fol. 573: That the only knowledge of this article *conserueth the Church.* And fol. 576. that it is *the summe of Christian doctrine, the sunne which lighteth the Church, which falling the Church falleth.* Tom. 4. in cap. 53. Isaiæ fol. 200. he writeth, that it is *as it were the foundation on which the Gospell relyeth, and which alone distinguisheth his religion from all others.* Fol. 201. that it *is like the liuely fountaine whence all treasures of diuine wisedome do flow, and the foundation of all the Church and Christianity.* And Prefat in Ionam, that it is *the cheife of Christian doctrine, and the summe of all the scripture.* Tom. 5. Prefat. in Galat. fol. 269. he affirmeth, that it is *the only rock of the Church.* And 273: *Who holdeth not this article, are* (sayth he) *either Iewes, or Turks, or Papists, or Heretiques.* And fol. 274. that *in this doctrine alone the Church is made and consisteth.* And fol. 333. he plainly confesseth, that it *is his only defence, without which* (as he speaketh) *both we and heretiks together with vs, had long since perished.* Tom. 6. in cap. 21. Genes. fol. 265. he termeth *it the cheifest article of fayth.* And tom. 7. epist. ad Liuones

The Summe.

The Definition.

The Sunne.

The foundation.

The rock.

Their defence.

fol. 499. auoucheth, that *it is the only way to heauen, and the summe of Christian life.* And finally in the first article concluded at Smalcald: *In this article are and consist all which in our life we teach, witnesse, and do against the Pope, the Diuell, and all the world.* This and much more writeth Luther in commendation of the necessity and excellency of the article touching iustification by only fayth. And of the contrary beliefe concerning iustification by works tom. 5. in cap. 3. Galat. fol. 257. he sayth: *It is the sinck of all euills.* And in cap. 4. fol. 402: That it *taketh away the truth of the Ghospell, faith, & Christ himselfe.*

The only way.

3. With Luther herein agree the Lutherans. For the Confession of Auspurg cap. de discrimine ciborum, sayth, that this article *is the proper doctrine of the ghospell.* And the Apology therof cap. de iustificat. that *it is the principall place of Christian doctrine.* And cap. de pœnit: *the cheifest place and principallest article about which they fight with their aduersaries; and the knowledge whereof they account most necessary to all.* The Conf. ssion of Saxony, that *this article being extinguished, there is no difference betwixt the Church and other men.* The Confession of Bohemia, that *this article is held of them for the cheifest of all, as which is the summe of all Christianity and piety.* The vniuersity of Wittemberg. tom. 2. Lutheri. fol. 248: *It is the cheifest article of the ghospell.* The Ministers of the Prince Electour in Colloq. Aldeburg. pag. 1. say, that this article is *as it were the summe and last end, to which all the other articles do look vnto.* And those of the D. of Saxony pag. 132. affirme, that *as long as this doctrine standeth, Luther standeth, yea Paul, yea God. The doctrine falling, Luther falleth, Paul falleth, God falleth; and all men are necessarily damned.* Those of Magdeburg in Sleidan lib. 21. call this article *the stay of saluation.* Melanchon tom. 2.

The summe of all Christianity and piety.

This falling, God falleth.

Lutheri

Lutheri fol. 506. termeth it *the cheifest article*. Kemnice part. 1. Examen. tit. de Iustificat. pag. 231: *The cheifest place*. And in locis part. 1. tit. de Iustificat. pag. 216. writeth, that *it is like the castle and principall bulwarck of all Christian doctrine and religion*. Lobechius disput. 22. pag. 515. addeth, that *it is one of the cheifest points of our fayth, because the prore and poupe of Christianity is contayned therein, and on it hangeth the hinges of our saluation*. Scnusselburg. tom 8. Catal. hæret. affirmeth, it to be *the cheifest article, wherein consisteth our saluation, and which is the head of our religion*. Finally (to omit other Lutherans) Brentius in Apolog. Wittemberg. part. 3. pag. 703. sayth, that *the essentiall difference betwixt a Protestant and a Papist is, that of the Protestant religion these are the first principles: The scripture, Christ the Sonne of God, & fayth or assurance of Gods fauour towards vs for Christs sake*.

The Bulwarck.

The essentiall difference.

4. Neither do Sacramentaries dissent herein from the Lutherans. For the Confession of Basle auoucheth it to be *the first and cheifest point in Euangelicall doctrine*. The French Confess. art. 18. calleth it *the foundation*. Zuinglius in Isagoge fol. 268. sayth it is *the summe of the Ghospell*. Bucer Respons. ad Abrincens. pag. 613. And Gualter Prefat. in Ioan. write, that *about this article is almost all the whole substance of dispute with them and Papists*. Bullinger in Compend. lib. 5. cap. 1. termeth it the *cheifest point of holy, Euangelicall, and Apostolicall doctrine*. And lib. 8. cap. 8: *The highest and cheifest head of Christian doctrine and of fayth*. Peter Martyr in locis tit. de Iustif. col. 939. sayth, *it is the head, fountaine, and stay of all piety*. Tom. 2. epist. ad Peregrin. col. 136: *It is the summe of summes, and cheifest head*. Caluin 4. Institut. cap. 11. 4. 1. that it is *the cheifest proppe of religion*. lib. 11. 4. 17: *The summe of all piety*. And Respons. and Sadolet. pag. 125. that *the knowledge thereof being gone, Christs glory is extinct*.

The summe of Summes.

tinct, religion abolished, and hope of salvation wholy overturned. And lib. de Necess. Reform. fol. 47. that the safety of the Church dependeth upon this doctrine no lesse then mans life depeneth of his soule, Parcus in Proœm. lib. de Iustificat: On this alone the hinges of our comfort and salvation do hang. And lib. 2. cap. 2. affirmeth that it was the cheifest cause of the separation of the Protestant Church from Popery. And lib. 4. cap. 2. sayth: The only doctrine of obtayning iustice and salvation by only fayth and of loosing them by incredulity, is the sincere and proper ghospell; all other doctrine in the scripture belongeth to the law. And those of Geneva Prefat. Syntag. Confess. avouch, that this article is the groundworke, formes, and soule of Christian religion; the summe of Euangelicall doctrine, of which men are called faythfull and true Christians, without which the knowledge of other articles hath no holesome frute. For it is the substantiall, inward, and formall cause of salvation; of which all Sacraments instituted by God are and were pledges and seales, vnto which article all the other do tend as to their center, and in which mans felicity consisteth.

the soule.

5. Neither do our English Protestants make lesse account of this their article of iustification by only fayth. For D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 6. cap. 3. pag. 562. sayth: It seemes to be the cheifest of all, and most fundamentall, as in which the Prove and puppe of our salvation consisteth; and who faine any other meanes of Iustification, do ouerthrow the foundation and most necessary heads of Christian religion, and are fallen from salvation and everlasting life. And Respond: ad Rat. 1. Camp. he writeth thus of their doctrine of Iustification by only fayth: If Iames, or a heavenly Angell disallow it, he is impure, wicked, and to be detested to hell. D. Humfrey in his oration de vitando fermento calleth this article, The cheifest point and hinges of fayth. D. Fulke de Success. pag. 4. The principall head of the ghospell.

the Prore & Puppe.

gospell. M. Fox in his acts pag. 440: *The foundation of all Christianity.* And pag. 770: *The only principall origen of our saluation.* And finally M. Powell lib. 2. de Antichristo cap. 5: *The summe of the doctrine of fayth* Neither is it to be mervailed, that Protestants so highly esteeme this their article, both because it is the cheifest bait wherwith they draw men vnto them, as also because (as Luther confessed) it is their cheife defence, without which they had long since perished; and finally because Iustification being one principall end of religion, if speciall fayth be the only meanes to attaine to iustification, vndoubtedly it ought highly to be esteemed of that religion, which believeth it to be such a meanes. Thus we see that according to the common opinion of Protestants, to believe himselfe to be iustified by only fayth, *is the cheifest article, the foundation, the stay, the head, the fountaine, the summe, the last end, the prove and puppe, the hinges, the proppe, the castle, the bulwarck, the essentiall difference, the definition, the soule, the forme, the formall cause, the only rocke, the only safegard of Protestancy, & the only way to heaven, which falling the church, yea God himselfe falleth.* But none can be a Protestant without the foundation, head, soule, forme, summe, definition &c. of a Protestant. Therefore none can be held for a Protestant, vnlesse he professe to believe to be iustified by only speciall fayth. Whomesoever therefore Protestants cannot proue to have held this article, they cannot with any reason and coulour challenge for Protestants. And because (as it shall hereafter appeare) they cannot proue that any one before Luther held this article, nay on the contrary we will proue that Luther first deuised it, they cannot with any apparence of truth auouch, that there was any Protestant before him. And in like sort,

The foundation,

Protestãts esteeme of only faith.

whome we can proue not to haue beleeued this article, we may euidently conclude, that they were no Protestants.

That it is necessary for a Protestant to beleeue all the fundamentall articles of Protestancy.

CHAP. VII.

Field.l.3.de eccles.c.2.

8. BESIDE the forefayd article of Iustification by only fayth, it is also necessary to the making of a Protestant or a member of the Protestant Church, that he beleeue at leest all the fundamentall points of Protestancy, either explicitly or implicitly, so that he obstinatly deny no one of them. This is manifest. First because (as I shewed before cap. 1.) it is the common opinion of Protestants, that all those are out of the Church, whosoeuer deny one fundamentall article. Againe, because themselues say, that the name of a fundamentall article doth insinuate, that it sustaineth the Church as the foundation sustaineth the house. Besides, all Protestants assigne truth or purity in doctrine for the mark of the Church; As the Confession of Ausparg cap. 7. The English Confession cap. 19. The Suitzers cap. de Eccles. and other Protestants commonly; and their meaning is, that it is the essentiall marck. Whereupon D. Whitaker Controuers.l.2.quest.5.cap.17.pag.541. sayth, that it is absolutely necessary and the essentiall marck. And at Rat. 3. Campiani, that it is the substantiall note. His Maiesty in his epistle to Cardinall Peron, that it is the substantiall forme of the Church. Caluin. epist. 29.

Num. 1.

Truth essentiall to the Church.

The

The purity of doctrine is the soule of the Church. And the same say Sadeel ad Sophism. Turriani loc. 1. Author de Eccles. in Danæo pag. 1029. Vorstius in Antibellarm. pag. 145. D. Willet. cont. 2. quæst. 3. pag. 102. Yea D. Morton part. 1. Apol. lib. 1. cap. 6. affirmeth, that *Protestants account the truth of Evangelicall doctrin the chiefest and almost only essentiall inseparable and perpetuall marck of the Church.* And hence it proceedeth, that they put the truth or purity of doctrine in their definition of the Church as an essentiall part thereof; as the French Confession cap. 27. The Magdeburgians Cent. 1. lib. 1. cap. 4 col. 140. Melancthon tom. 1 in cap. 16. Matthæi. D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quæst. 5. cap. 20. pag. 552. Sadeel ad Sophism. Turriani loc. 21. and others commonly. But this purity of doctrine if it must be in any articles, especially it must be in those which are fundamentall, as is manifest, and the Protestants do graunt. For thus writeth D. Morton part. 1. Apol. lib. 2. cap. 38. *Purity in the fundamentall principles of faith is necessary to the being and making of the Church.* And D. Feild lib. 2. de Eccles. cap. 3: *Purity from fundamentall errour, is necessarily required to a Church.* And the like hath Vorstius lib. cit. pag. 148. Nay the English Confession art. 19. defineth *the visible Church of Christ to be a congregation of faythfull men in which the pure word of God is preached and the Sacraments duely ministred according to Christs ordinance in al those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.* And his majesty ep. cit: *It is needfull that the churches be united amog themselues in vnity of faith and doctrine in those points, which are necessary to salvation.* And hereupon diuers Protestants deny those Corinthians who denyed the Resurrection, and those Galathians, who overturned the Gholspell of Christ, to haue byn members of the Church; because they denyed a fundamentall point

Purity in fundamental points essentiall to the Church.

Whitak. Cont. 2. q. 5. c. 18. Sadeel l. 2. de Eccl. c. 2. Morton Apol. lib. cap. 38.

point of Christian fayth. Wherefore vnlesse Protestants will deny their common doctrine in this matter, reiect their owne definition of the Church, cast away their only marke of the Church, and leaue no marke of her at all, they cannot auouch any one to haue byn a Protestant, who dissented from them in any fundamentall point of doctrine.

2. If any one say, that although he, who denyeth any fundamentall point of Protestancy, cannot be of the visible Protestant Church, yet may he be of their inuisible Church: I answeare, that (as shall be shewed hereafter) there can be no Church which is inuisible in profession of fayth, howsoeuer it be inuisible in iustice and predestination; and therefore none can be of the inuisible Church, who is not also of the visible. Againe Protestants will haue none to be of the inuisible Church, but such as are iust. But how is he iust, who denieth Gods faith, and maketh him a lyer, and that in a principall point of religion? Besides, Protestants say, that none can be a member of the inuisible Church, vnlesse he be also a member of the visible Church, if so conueniently he may.

Leo. serm. 4. de Nat. Hier. lib. 3. epist. Ruffi. Aug. l. de haer. & q. 21. in Mat. & 18. de ciuit. c. 51. Basilius in Theodor. lib. 4. c. 10.

3. Moreouer the holy Fathers most frequently, and sometymes also Protestants themselues, do teach, that it is necessary to a faythful and believing man, that he deny no one article of fayth, and much lesse a fundamentall or principall article. Finally, Protestants are wont to laugh at Catholiks if they proue any Father to haue byn a Papist, because he held some fundamentall point of Papistry. For thus writeth Pareus lib. 1. de amiss. gratiæ cap. 1: *It is ridiculous for him to conclude S. Augustin to haue byn a Papist, because in this errour he agrees with them; no lesse them if you in-*

ferre,

serre, that we are Papists, because we agree with Papists in some thing. And D. White inside tence of his Way cap. 45. pag. 432 : *His holding of some things superstitious, by which the Church of Rome hath entertayned, proues not that he professed the same fayth the Church of Rome now doth, because the fayth of the sayd Church comprehends much more then he held; and what he held is now otherwise expounded and applyed then by him it was.* And in his Way pag. 298: *If he would deale faythfully and to the point, he should not say Bernard professed the Roman fayth and was a monke; but he should haue shewed, that he professed the present Roman fayth, as the Councell of Trent and the Iesuits haue set it downe, at least in the fundamentall points thereof.* Let them then abide the law which themselues haue made, and let not them conclude any one to haue byn a Protestant, because he agreed with them in one or more points, vnlesse he agreed with them at least in all fundamentall points of their doctrine. I adde also, that against Protestants we do rightly conclude, that the holy Fathers were Papists, if we do shew that they dissented from Protestants in one or more fundamentall points. For they will not deny, but that the Fathers were either Papists or Protestants: But Protestants they were not, if they denyed their doctrine in any fundamentall point thereof: therfore they must needs be Papists. And the like is not of others, whome Protestants cannot cõclude to haue byn theirs, if they can proue that they were none of ours. Because neither we will graunt, nor they can auouch, that such were either ours or theirs, as they graunt of the holy Fathers. Be it therefore certaine and assuted, that to a Protestant is necessarily required, that either explicitly, or at least implicitly and vertually he belieue all the fundamentall points of Protestancy, and willfully deny

What is necessarily required to a Protestant

no one

no one of them. And that therefore Protestants can no way challenge any, who reiected any one of their fundamentall and principall articles. It remayneth that we set downe the fundamentall articles of Protestancy, because Protestants themselues agree not herein, but as S. Augustin sayd, that the Donatists did, concerning sinnes which they would haue to exclude men out of the Church; so Protestants, in a strange fashion distinguish the fundamentall points of their fayth, deuising rules of distinction amongst them, not out of the scriptures but out of their owne heads.

lib. de vnic. baptism. c. vlt.

Which be the fundamentall heads of Protestancy.

CHAP. VIII.

1. THAT we may determine which be the fundamentall articles of Protestant religion, we must first shew, that all Protestants professe to receiue the Confession of Auspurge, at least in the principall and fundamentall articles thereof. Of the Lutheran Protestants this is manifest. For in their conference at Aldeburg both parties of them agreed to admit it for a rule of their disputation. And ibidem pag. 404. those of the Electors side do say: *We referre our selues and do looke vnto the Confession of Auspurg, as to the foundation of religion next after the word of God.* And other Lutherans in Zanchius in Supplicat. ad Senat. Argentinens. pag. 70. do appoint, that *it be taught according to the Confession of Auspurge, presented to Charles the 5. anno 1530, and the Apology thereof subscribed at Numberg, and*

How much Protestants esteeme the Conf. of Ausp.

The foundation of Religion.

that

that it be the square and rule of all religion in all articles. Hesshusius lib. de presen. corp. Christi in cœlo affirmeth, that amongst the Lutherans *all that are promoted to degrees and cure of soules, do sweare to the Confession of Ausburg and the Apology thereof.* The same testifyeth Lobechius disp. 1. pag. 12. and as Lauatherus addeth anno 1530: *The lawes of the vniuersity of Wittemberg do straightly forbid to defend any opinions which are contrary to this Confession.* Hesshusius also lib. cit. writeth, that the *authority thereof ought to be most holy amongst all godly men.* Westphalus cont. Laskum affirmeth, that it *containeth the summe of doctrine founded in the word of God.* Erneſtus Regius in vita Vrbani, that *it is the square and rule of controuersies in the Church.* Lobechius lib. cit. that it *is the rule of fayth and doctrine distinguishing the orthodoxall Church from the heterodoxall.* Reineccius in armatura tom. 1. cap. 28. affirmeth, that *it was inspired from heauen, and written by instinct of the holy ghost.* Nay some Lutherans, (as testifieth Lasius epist. ad Regem Poloniæ) sayd, *that they would rather doubt of the doctrine of Paul, then of the Confession of Ausburg.* And with the Lutherans herein conspire the Sacramentaries. For as Bucer confessed in the Conference of Ratisbon: *The Protestants condemne all writings, which are repugnant to the Confession of Ausburge and the Apology thereof.* Caluin admonit. vlt. ad Westphalum pag. 797. sayth: *Touching the Confession of Ausburg I answere thus, that as it was published at Ratisbon, there is not one word in it contrary to our doctrine.* And epist. 236. sayth, that *he wittingly and willingly subscribed to it.* Beza epist. 1. writeth in this sort: *I define those to be our Churches, which hold the Confession of Ausburg, the French Confession &c.* And Apol. 1. cont. Saintem pag. 297: *Neither is the Confession of Ausburg such, as any pious man may reiect it.* Zanchius loc. cit. receiued the Confession of Ausburge *as the square*

The square of religion.

They sweare to it.

The authority thereof most holy.

Containeth the summe of doctrine.

The Rule of fayth.

Inspired frõ heauen.

Sarium anno 1548.

and

and rule of all doctrine. And as Vorstius writeth Respons. ad epist. Parei pag. 91: *In the vniuersity of Heddelberg they vsed to sweare to no Confession, but to that of Ausburg.* Or as D. Whitaker affirmeth Cont. 2. quest. 5. cap. 5. pag. 505: *The Confession of Ausburg is receiued of all Protestants, vnlesse perhapps it be in one word or two, rather then in any opinion.* And in truth seing all Sacramentaries professe to hold the Lutherans, (who follow the Confession of Auspurg) for their brethren in Christ, and besides, when we obiect vnto them their dissention in matters of fayth, they appeale vnto their harmony or syntagme of Confessions, amongst which the Confession of Auspurg is placed, as do those of Geneua Prefat. Syntagmatis, the Switzers Prefat. suæ Confess. Beza epist. 1. Sadeel Indice Repetit. Turrian pag. 808. and respons. ad Theses Posnan. c. 11. Vorstius in Antibellarm. pag. 168. D. Feild lib. 3. de Eccles. cap. 42. & 42. D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quæst. 5. cap. 8. pag. 521. D. Andrews Respons. ad Apol. Bellarm. c. 1. D. Fulke de Succes. pag. 287. & 304. D. White in his way to the Church pag. 138. and others commonly. When as (I say) the Sacramētaries do thus, they must needs approue the Confession of Auspurg, at least in all the principall and fundamentall points thereof. For (I hope) they will not hold thē for brethren in Christ, whome they see to dissent from them in fundamentall points of Christian fayth; nor say, that those Confessions agree, which are repugnant in the very foundation of beliefe.

Which the cōfess. of Ausp. accepteth fundamētal articles

2. But this Confession of Auspurg so generally receiued, and of so high account with Protestants as we haue rehearsed, hath set downe and declared which be the fundamentall points of Protestancy. For in the beginning thereof is set this title; *The pu-*

ofe

vnall articles; and after that many Protestanticall opinions are rehearted, thus it sayth of them. cap. 21. *This is the summe of the doctrine which is deliuered in our Churches.* And afterward naming certaine controuersies of Indulgences, Pilgrimages, & the like, it sayth of them: *These kind of matters we haue let passe, that those things which are the cheifest in this cause might be easierly knowne.* Againe: *those things only are rehearsed, which were necessary to be told.* And finally; *VVe would present these articles before written, in which our Confession might be extant, and the summe of their doctrine who teach vs, might be seene.* And in another edition of this Confession in Melanchon. tom. 3. thus is written in the end thereof: *VVe haue comprised the summe of Euangelicall doctrine necessary to Churches.* Wherefore, vnlesse Protestants will reiect their first and most maiesticall Confession of Auspurg, they must needs confesse that the articles thereof are the summe of Protestant doctrine, the principal articles of their fayth, are they only, which are necessary to be told, and the summe of Euangelicall doctrine necessary to Churches. But surely such are fundamentall articles.

The sume of Protest. doctrine.

Cheifest points.

Only necessary.

Sume of doctrine necessary.

3. Neither doth the sayd Confession alone, but also many other great Protestants acknowledge the articles of it to be fundamentall. For thus hath the Apology of that Confession in Melanchon tom. 3. fol. 91: *VVe haue comprised in the Confession of Auspurg almost the summe of all Christian doctrine.* And Melanchon himselfe in the preface of that Apology writeth, that that Confession *is truth necessary to the Church.* And likewise in the preface of his 3. tome: *I gathered together the heads of confession, comprising almost the summe of the doctrine of our Churches. The whole forme of the Confession was after sent to Luther, who wrote back that he had read and allowed this*

Truth necessary to the Church.

Con-

Confession. And tom. 4. Respons. ad Staphylum pag. 817. sayth, that *the Confession* (of Ausburg) *containeth the whole body of doctrine*. And in Prefat. 2. tom. Lutherans *The summe of doctrine which our Church preached & publikely* The whole body of doctrine. *comprehended in the Confession of Ausburg*. Likewise the D. of Wittemberg in the preface of his Confession speaking of the Confession of Ausburg sayth thus: *VVe commanded our preachers to write the summe of their doctrine*. And the Ministers of the Elector in colloq. Aldeburg. Script. 3. pag. 21. say: *VVe doubt not but the summe of doctrine revealed from heauen w. dextrously, plainly, and most sweetly contayned in the Confession of Ausburg*. And pag. seq: *VVhat the Confession of Ausburg we comprehended the summe of doctrine*. Kemnice Præfat. lib. de cœna: *The summe of wholesome doctrine is comprehended in the Confession of Ausburg out of the word of God*. Westphalus defens. altera cont. Laskum sayth: It containeth *in brieue the summe of Christian doctrine*. Iames Andrews lib. cont. Hosium pag. 221. *The summe of pious doctrine is contained in the Confession of Ausburg*. Finally the Lutherans (as the Sacramentaries of Newstad write in Admonit. de lib. Concord. cap. 4. pag. 116) *do place in the role of heretiks as erring in the foundation of fayth and saluation, all those who find any fault with the Confession of Ausburg, or dissent from it in any article*. And as touching the Sacramentaries themselues, the Palatin Confession pag. 198. sayth thus: *That Confession of fayth which was presented at Ausburg, and the Apology annexed thereto, was taken out of the doctrine of the Apostles & Prophets, and the foresayd Creed, as a certaine litle summe*. Caluin. lib. 1. de Lib. arbit. pag. 142: *VVhen at Ausburg there was to be exhibited a forme of Confession* (Melanchthon the Author thereof) *would not make any stay, but only in that doctrine, which alone is proper to the Church and necessary to saluation to be knowne*.

Note.

Doctrine necessary to saluation.

4. Acco

4. According therefore to the verdict, both of Lutherans and Sacramentary Protestants, their Confession of Auspurg contayneth *the summe & whole body of Protestant doctrine, and only those things which are necessary to be told, and that only doctrine which is proper to the church, and is necessary to be knowne for salvation.* Whosoeuer therfore dissenteth from the Confession of Auspurg, dissenteth from Protestants in the summe and body of Protestancy, in things that are necessary, in doctrine necessary to the Church, and necessary to salvation. But vndoubtedly who dissenteth in such things dissenteth in fundamentall points. And this manner of examining who is a Protestant, cannot be disliked of Protestants, because themselues vsed it against the Anabaptists in their Conference at Frankentall, wherein they proue, that the Anabaptists were not before the yeare of Christ 1521: *For (say they) if you read ouer all histories, you shall not find any people from the beginning of the world, who had a Confession of fayth like to yours.* They are therefore of opinion, that it is necessary for an Anabaptist, that he hold their Confession. Why then may not we say the like is necessary to a Protestant. Besides, Sadeel in Refutat. Thes. Posnan. pag. 866. sayth, that we ought to judge of the fayth of the reformed Churches by the Confessions of their fayth; which rule we now follow.

5. And if any Protestant do not thinke, that the articles of the Confession of Auspurg be fundamentall, let him take the Confession of Saxony, to which many principall Protestants subscribed, and which they composed with mind to present it to the Councell of Trent. For this Confession affirmeth her articles to be fundamentall saying cap. 23: *This is the summe of doctrine, which with one mouth we preach in our* Fundam. articles according to the Confess. of Saxony.

Churches. And soone after: *It is true doctrine and necessary to the Church*. And Hospin part. 2. Hist. fol. 215. saith that the composers of this Confession auouch this in summe, *that that writing conteyneth clearly and fundamentally the principall articles of Christian fayth, and doctrine of Sacraments instituted of Christ*. Or if he please let him take the Confession of Strasburg, which in the end thus writeth of the articles thereof: *These are the cheife points, in which our men haue somewhat gone from the common doctrine of the Clergy*. Or else the Scottish generall Cõfessiõ, wherein thus speake the Scots: *VVe beleeue, confesse, and subscribe, and affirme before God and the whole world, that this only is the true Christian fayth, which pleaseth God, and bringeth saluation to men, which is now layd open to the world and receiued of diuers Churches and Kingdoms, especially of the Scottish Church*. For these Confessions do affirme, that their articles *are principall necessary to the Church, and their doctrine the only true Christian doctrine which bringeth saluation*. But surely such articles be fundamentall. Therefore the articles of these Confessions be fundamentall articles in Protestancy. And consequently, that a man be accounted a Protestant according to the iudgement of these Confessions, it is necessary, that he professe their articles. Or finally let him make choice of the Bohemian Confession, in the Preface whereof it is written thus: *VVe imbrace and hold all things which belong to the true Church and without which she can be no where on earth*. For without doubt such things are fundamentall.

According to the Cõfession of Strasburg

According to the Cõfession of Scotland.

According to the Cõfession of Bohemia.

6. But if any will not admit either the artícles of the Confession of Auspurg or of Saxony (which are Confessions of Lutherans) nor the articles of the Confessions of Strasburg or Scotland (which are Confessions of Sacramentaries) be finally

finally the articles of the Bohemian Confession (which is sayd to be the Confession of the Waldenses) to be the fundamentall articles of Protestancy. First he shall shew, that touching which are fundamentall articles, he agreeth neither with Lutherans nor Sacramentaries, nor Waldenses. Againe, besides that which we haue repeated out of Protestants concerning their account of the Confession of Auspurg, he shall herein reiect those Confessions to which Protestants (as themselues say) *yeld almost as much as Papists do to the Councell of Trent, which they hold for authenticall writings, and which they say haue byn sealed with the bloud of many martyrs, and approued of Kings, Princes, and common wealthes, most excellent Deuines, & great seruants of God.* Assuredly if there be any certainty or worth in Protestant doctrine, it is in their Confession of fayth. Moreover, he can name no other articles which Protestants by publike and common iudgement haue agreed to be fundamentall, and therefore either they haue not by publike consent determined which articles they hold for fundamentall, or certainly no iudgement or decree of theirs is to be more esteemed of them, then that which we find in their Confessions of fayth. Wherefore either they are to be held for fundamentall articles, or else Protestants are not certaine which are fundamentall articles of their fayth. And if they be not certaine herof, they cannot be certaine what is the essence or substance of a Protestant, or who is a Protestant, who not, seing (as I shewed before) the only essentiall forme and substance of a Protestant they put in the beliefe of their fundamentall articles. Either therefore they haue not yet determined which are their fundamentall articles, and consequently they haue not determined what is the

Vorstius in Præfat. Antiboll. Præfat. Syntagm. Confess.

If Protestants be not certaine which are fundam. articles they are not certaine of their Church.

substance of a Protestant, or who is a Protestant who not, who is a member of their Church, who an alien; or that which they have determined in their forsayd Confessions, is to be taken for their decree and determination in this matter. Finally, I regard not, what articles this or that Protestant iudgeth to be fundamentall, for I might set downe which Luther tom. 1. in Præfat. Disput. fol. 419. or which Zuinglius Pretat. Conf. fidei, or which Beza in fine breuis Confess. or which Bullinger Præfat. Compend. haue reckoned for fundamentall articles; but I would determine this matter out of their publike Confessions of fayth, because they cannot deny them, but in denying their fayth; as also because they are of more authority amongst Protestants, and finally because themselues require vs so to do.

Roderiod Thes. Poseuan. c 32. Beza epist. 2. Reinold. prælect. 4.

7. Let it be therefore assured and stedfast, that according to the iudgement generally of all Protestants it is necessarily and before all matters required to a Protestant that he belieue Iustification by only speciall or particuler fayth, because this is the soule, life, definition and all in a Protestant; and moreouer (according to the iudgements of the foresayd Confessions) that he belieue at least virtually and implicitly all their articles, and wittingly deny none of them, because as we see they are fundamentall articles of Protestancy, without which one cannot haue the whole essence or substance of a Protestant, nor be an entire and absolute Protestant, but only in part and in some sort. And we (as hath byn often sayd) treat here only of an entire and absolute Protestant, such as at least hath all the substantiall parts of a Protestant, and endeauour to prone that Luther was the author of such a company and of such a faith and

What necessary to a Protestant.

We speak of any who are Protestats only in part.

and religion, and regard not whither that before his tyme there were any, who were Protestants only in part and in some sort, and held only some part of Protestant religion, but not the whole substance thereof. And herupon we frame an invincible argument, to proue that there was no true Protestant or Protestant church before Luther. Euery true Protestant believeth Iustification by only speciall faith, and at least vitually and implicitly believeth the articles of the Confession of Auspurg, or of Saxony, Scotland, Strasburg, or Bohemia. But there was no man, no Church before Luther who thus believed. Therefore no true Protestant or Protestant church. The Maior is the very definition of a true Protestant, gathered partly out of the common doctrine of all Protestants, partly out of the foresayd Confessions of their fayth. The Minor being negatiue is sufficiently manifest, by that neither Luther, nor any in his tyme, or to this day could produce any one man or company who before Luthers preaching had believed in that sort. This foundation therefore touching the essence and substance of a Protestant and Protestant Church being layd, to wit, that he only is a true absolute Protestant, who believeth Iustification by only speciall fayth, and the foresayd other fundamentall points of Protestancy, and that the Protestant Church is a company of such believers, and the Protestant religion such a belief and worship of God; I will endeauour in this next book out of Protestants testimonies and Confessions to proue, that Luther was the first beginner of their Church and Religion.

The definition of a true Protestit.

The end of the first Booke.

THE SECOND BOOKE.

Of the Author, or Beginner of the Protestant Church and Religion.

CHAP. I.

That Protestants confesse that the substance of their Church and Religion was perished when Luther *began.*

THe first demonstration, wherewith we will proue, that Luther was the author and first beginner of the Protestant Church and religion, we will take out of Protestants Confessions of the substantiall destruction of their Church, religion & principall article of Iustification by only fayth,

Protestats confesse their religion was perished.

fayth, before Luther arose. For of the destruction of their fayth and religion thus writeth Luther himself tom. 1. Propositi. 62. fol. 375: *Certaine it is that our Apostolicall Bishops reigning, Gods fayth perished.* And lib. de Captiu. Babylon. tom. 2. fol. 77: *The Popes tyranny hath many ages agone extinguished the fayth.* And lib. de abrog. Miss. fol. 249. he sayth to the Catholikes: *Ye haue extinguished the Ghospell.* And lib. de pijs ceremonijs fol. 387: alias 393: *The doctrine of the ghospell lay destroyed by humane traditions.* Tom. 3. in psalm. 1. fol. 126: *What thinkest thou was in the Church, but a whirle wind of Gods wrath, by which we were thrust into so many, so different, so inconstant, so vncertaine, and those infinite, glosses of Lawyers, and opinions of Deuines, & in the meane tyme Christ being altogether vnknowne, stumbling into many quicke sands, gulfes, and shares of conscience were knockt together.* And in psalm. 22. fol. 345: *Christ together with fayth is now extinguished.* And fol. 348: *Fayth lyeth extinct.* And in psalm. 51. fol. 460: *The former age could neither vnderstand nor soundly teach the greatest and weightiest points.* Præfat. in psalm. Grad. fol. 509: *God punisheth contempt so as he plainly taketh away his word, whereof Popery is a notable example, in which we see it hath so fallen out.* And fol. 568: *Fayth it selfe was plainly extinct.* Tom. 4. Præfat. Eccl. fol. 1: *The schooles of Deuines haue wholy extinguished most assured fayth in Christ, together with all the knowledge of Christ.* Tom. 5. in cap. 2. Galat. fol. 306: *The Papists with their impious and blasphemous doctrine haue not only obscured, but simply haue taken away the Ghospell, and ouerwhelmed Christ.* And fol 322: *Christs Ghospell being obscured, yea truly ouerwhelmed, the Pope &c.* In c. 4. fol. 376: *This most common and most receiued opinion of the vncertainty (of the remission of sinnes) was surely an article of fayth in all Popery, wherewith truly they ouerwhelmed the doctrine of fayth, destroyed fayth, and shut Christ out of the*

Perished.

Extinguished.

destroyed

Christ altogether vnknown

christ and fayth extinguished.

All knowledge of Christ wholy extinct.

Not only obscured but simply taken away.

christ shut out of the Church.

Church. Fol. 400: *The Pope hath vtterly extinguished Christian liberty.* In cap. 1. Petri: *The sincere knowledge of fayth was extinct.* In cap. 15. 1. Cor. fol. 134: *Vnlesse our helps they had neuer learnt one word of the Ghospell.* And fol. 141: *They had not knowne one iote of the Gospell vnlesse by our labour and study it had byn brought forth into the world.* Tom. 6. in cap. 3. Genes. fol. 43: *Wholesome doctrine was by little and little extinct.* In cap. 4. fol. 57: *The light of the word was extinguished by wicked Popes.* In cap. 17. fol. 199: *That I may say all in one word the Pope hath truly buryed Christ.* In cap. 48. fol. 643: *The Pope hath obscured, nay destroyed the doctrine of fayth.* In cap. 49. fol. 660: *The Pope hath truly obscured the doctrine and taken away the Promises, that we knew not what Christ was.* Fol. 666: *He hath extinguished the Gospell.* Tom. 7. lib. de Missa fol. 230: *The knowledge of Christ was truly abolished and destroyed. The Epistles cannot deny, the matter it selfe proclaimeth it.* And fol. 231: *All true Worship of God being extinct from the bottom &c.* Epist. ad Fredericum Electorem fol. 506: *The Pope of Rome hath most plainly rooted out the Ghospell truly oppressed and ouerthrowne.* lib. cont. Papatum fol. 469: *Fayth was weakened, choaked, and extinguished, and Christian liberty left.* Thus plainly speaketh Luther almost in all his Latin tomes of the substantiall destruction of his fayth and Ghospell before that (as he sayth) he brought it againe into the world. To which he addeth in his 7. Dutch tome in his admonition to the Germans: *This abomination was increased so, that they blotted out and suppresst the words of the Sacrament and sayth, so that neither a letter, nor point of them remayned in all Popes, in all masses, and bookes.* Thus Luther.

Without Luther not one word or iot of the Ghospell.

Christ truly buried.

Knowledge of Christ truly destroyed.

Ghospell most plainly rooted out.

2. In like manner the Protestants in Sleidan lib. 1. fol. 258: *The Pope made lawes, by which true knowledge was vtterly oppressed.* Melanchon tom. 2. Lutheri fol.

192: *Scholastical doctrine being received, faith was destroyed, the doctrine of works being admitted.* The Magdeburgians Præfat. Centur. 5: *There was an extreme abolition of true Religion and the word of God vnder Popery.* Caluin Præfat. Institut: *In former ages men had extinguished the light of God.* And 1. Institut. cap. 11. §. 9: *Many ages since true religion was drowned and ouerthrowne.* 4. Institut. cap. 2. §. 2: *Vnder Popery that doctrine without which Christianity cannot consist was all buryed and shut out.* Reſponſ. ad Sadolet. pag. 128. he ſayth, that the neceſsity to leaue the Roman Church was, *That the light of diuine truth was extinct, the word of God buryed &c.* And p. 130. maketh this ſpeach vnto God in defence of his forſaking the Roman Church: *There were not a few profane opinions, which euen by the ground ouerthrow the cheifeſt points of that doctrine, which thou didſt deliuer vnto vs by word.* Lib. de neceſſ. Refor. pa. 49: *When the word of God was choaked with theſe ſo many & ſo thick darkneſſes, Luther ſtept forth &c.* pag. 62: *Now prayed to God with aſſured faith, that is in earneſt, neither could they, for Chriſt being buryed in that manner as he was &c.* Reſponſ. ad Verſipell. pag. 358: *They haue extinguished the doctrine of ſaluation.* In Plycopan. pag. 388: *The word of God being ended by peruerſe vſe and ſloth now returneth to light.* In Rom. 11. veri. 22: *The truth was taken away.* Sadeel. de vocat. Miniſt. pag. 552: *God ſuffered that light to be put out which ſhould perpetually haue lightned vs in gouerning our life.* Criſpin Præfat. operum Occolampadij: *Both the doctrine of ſaluation and piety were taken away, they banished out of the Church all pure worſhip of God.* Celius ſecundus Curio de amplitudine regni Dei lib. 1. pag. 321: *And ſo by little and little true Chriſt was taken out of the world, and Antichriſt put in his ſtead.* And Hoſpin. part. 1. Hiſtor. lib. 4. pag. 191. writeth, that *after 800. yeares after Chriſt the light of the holeſome and true doctrine began to be darkned, till it was*

Extreme abolition of religion.

The ſubſtance of Chriſtianity buried.

Cheifeſt points of doctrine ouerthrowne from the roote.

Word of God ended.

The light put out.

Pure worſhip baniſhed.

True Chriſt taken out of the world.

The light cleane put out.

it was vtterly put out. Thus forraine Protestants, both Lutherans and Sacramentaries.

The truth perished frō earth.

3. Amongst English Protestants thus writeth M. Bale Cent. 4. c. 6: *Holesome truth perished from the earth.* Cent. 1. pag. 69: *From this tyme (anno 607) partly of heauenly doctrine vanished out of the Church.* In his Apology against Priesthood and vowes fol. 3: *Two things haue chefly byn the cause of the vtter decay and full destruction of Christian religion &c.* M. Powell in Itinerarium Cambriæ lib. 2. cap. 7. sayth, that about the yeare 1189: *There was the cheife raigne of darknesse, in so much that not only preaching of the true word, but also the true religion was banished, and scarce the name of Christians remayned.* M. Fox in the Protestation before his Acts, affirmeth that about the yeare 1215. and 1080: *Christian sayth was extinguished.* And pag. 840. that Christian Religion *was wholy changed into Idolatry.* D. Fulke ad Cauillat. Stapletoni: *Scarce could he fiue hundred yeares after banish the true doctrine of saluation out of the Churches of Europe.* And finally the Apology of the English Church part. 5. cap. 13. diuis. 1. sayth, that Papists *haue broken in peeces all the pipes and conduits, haue stopped vp all the springs and choaked the fountaine of liuing waters, and by damming vp all the fountains of Gods word, haue brought the people into a pitifull thirst.* Item: *With great distresse went they scattering about seeking some sparck of heauenly light to refresh their consciences withall, but that light was already throughly quenched out, so that they could find none. This was a rufull state, this was a lamentable forme of Gods Church. It was a misery to liue therein without the Ghospell, without light, without all comfort.* Thus write these learned Protestants both English and Strangers of the destruction of their doctrine, their fayth, their religion, and Ghospell before Luther wrote, which do so plainly testify the substantiall destruction ther-

Vanished out of the Church.

Vtter decay & full destructiō of religiō.

Scarse name of Christianity remayned.

Not a sparck of diuine light found.

Protestāts light throughly quenched out.

of, as

of, as I may well vse S. Augustins words in the like occasion: *If I should speake thus, they would resist and cry, that I speake not truly, thought not truly. For in these words, if they were spoken by others, they would imagin no other meaning, then that, which in the foresayd (Protestants) they will not understand.* Lib. 1. de pec. mer. &c. 9.

4. Neither write they otherwise of the destruction of their principall and most fundamentall article of Iustification by only fayth. For thus the Confession of Anspurg cap. 20: *When the doctrine of fayth, which ought to be principall in the Church, lay so long vnknowne, as all must needs confesse that there was a most profound silence of the iustice of fayth, that in sermons only the iustice of works was spoken of in Churches &c.* And tit. de bonis operibus pag. 25: *In tymes past certaine absurd opinions horribly ouerwhelmed this doctrine, in which the vnlearned faigned that men did satisfy the law of God. In the meane tyme there was great silence how Christ is to be apprehended by fayth.* And pag. 27: *There was no word of fayth which is necessary for remission of sinnes.* And pag. 19: *In tymes past there was great silence in Churches of the exercises of fayth.* And Præfat. Apol. Confess. August. in Melanchthon tom. 3. fol. 27: *All Churches, Monasteries, schooles, briefly all bookes of late diuines, were before mute of the iustice of fayth. No man taught sinnes to be forgiuen by fayth in Christ, Sacraments were impiously profaned, after that opinion, that they iustify by the work wrought, was receiued. And this opinion did wholy oppresse the doctrine of fayth.* Præfat. Conf. Saxoniæ: *All this comfort, which is necessary to euery one, how a man conuerted to God is iustified, was vnknown.* The Protestant Princes and Cities in Sleidan lib. 11. fol. 240: *The contention is about the doctrine of fayth, and of the true knowledge of God, which is the cheifest head of Christian life and of pure religion. And it cannot (say they) be denyed, that this doctrine was vtterly extinct, and a new doctrine brought*

Protestants confesse their iuste dam. art. perished.

Sole faith vnknown

Horribly ouerwhelmed.

No man taught &c. All Prot. cõmfort vnknown

Vtterly extinct.

brought in. And lib. 13. fol. 304: *It cannot be denyed, that there was no word taught of receiuing grace by Christ of remission of sinnes.* Luther in Catechismo Maiori tom. 5. fol. 627: *Popery raigning, fayth wholy neglected and obscured was in pitifull plight. No man believed Christ to be a Lord, who had reconciled vs to the Father without our workes.* Tom. 7. in c. 5. Matth. 1. fol. 23: *The Popish company saying nothing of the cheifest article of iustification by fayth in Christ &c.* And in 3. Symbol. fol. 140. *I have observed, that all errours, heresies, and all impiety came into the church principally, because this article, or this part of Christian fayth in Iesus Christ was despised and neglected, or vtterly lost.* And in the Epitaphe graued vpon Luthers tombe is this verse: *He restored to the world the difference lost before,* which is meant of the difference which Luther taught to be between the law and the ghospell, that the law teacheth iustification by good works, the ghospell by only fayth, without which difference Luther professeth that Christianity cannot stand. And in his table talkes cap. de morte he thus speaketh: *Shew me one place of iustification of fayth in the decrees, in the decretals, in the Clementines, in all the summes and sentences, in all the sermons of Monks, in the statutes of Synods, in all the Postilles, in all Hieronme, Gregorie &c.* Thus assured Luther was, that before he preached of this principall article of iustification by only fayth, there was no news in the whole world.

no mã believed iustification without workes.

Cocleus to. 2. pag. 127

5. The same confesseth his Copemate Melanchon, who tom. 2. Respons. ad Clerum Colon. pag. 96. hath these words: *The doctrine of penuance was ouerwhelmed, there was no word of fayth by which remission of sinnes is to be receiued:* and pag. 97: *The doctrine of true inuocation and of the exercises of fayth lay dead. If any* (sayth he) *denie, that such was the state of the Church he may be disproued not only by testimonies of honest men, but also by the bookes of Monkes.*

And

And pag. 99: *There was no speach of the hope of free mercy.* And lib. de vsu integri Sacramenti pag. 188: *The Popes haue destroyed the true doctrine of fayth.* And the same Melanchthon or Carion in Chronico lib. 4. pag. 418. & seq: *Those errours being forged and established by publike authority, drew after them a great ruine, wherewith they wholy destroyed the doctrine of iustice before God, and free remission of sinnes.* And pag. 439: *Schools diuinity quite trampled and extinguished the least sparkles of pure doctrine, touching the law, the ghospell, fayth and iustification before God.* And pag. 483: *They haue quite taken away the difference betweene the law and the ghospell.* Vigand. lib. de bonis & malis Germaniæ: *The difference betwixt the law and the ghospell was quite blotted out after the Apostles tym.* The Magdeburgians Præf. Centur. 13. *The doctrine of fayth without works was extinct.* The matter it selfe shewed, *that pure doctrine was vtterly suppressed.* Kemnice in locis part. 2. tit. de Iustificat. pag. 246: *In all ages the light of holesome doctrine touching iustification first decayed, after more and more obscured, and last was plainly lost and extinguished.* And pag. 244: *In our tyme God hath restored the doctrine of iustification out of most thick darkenesse.* And Hunnius Præfat. lib. de libero arbit: *The article of iustification was by Luther brought into light of out of the more then Chymerian darkenesse of former ages.* Thus the Lutherans.

The least sparkles extinguished.

Quite blotted out.

Plainly lost.

6. The like Confession make the Sacramentaries. For thus writeth Caluin Respons. ad Sadolet. pag. 125: *We say, that doctrine (of Iustification by only fayth) was by you blotted out of the memory of men.* Lib. de Necess. Reform. pag. 46: *The vertue of fayth was vtterly extinct, the benefit of Christ destroyed, mans saluation ouerthrowen.* And lib. de vera Reform. pag. 322: *By these, the Apostolicall doctrine was corrupted, nay destroyed and abolished.* Iezlonius de bello Euchar. fol. 342 *The doctrine of iustification was*

Blotted out of memory.

Corrupted, nay destroyed.

was most fowly darkned & corrupted. Peremlib. 5. de Iustificat. cap. 3: *The doctrine of grace began to be obscured, and at last to be vtterly oppressed in Popery.* Finally M. Fox in his Acts printed 1610. pag. 391. sayth: *In these later dayes the only name of Christ remayned among Christians. As touching sayth, the end, and the vse of the law, of grace and iustification by sayth, of liberty of a Christian man, there was no mention nor any word almost spoken of.* Thus both Lutheran and Sacramentary Protestants confesse, their doctrine of iustification (in which as we haue seene they affirme the definition, life, soule, and all points of a Protestant to consist) to haue perished, byn extinguished, horribly ouerwhelmed, vanished out of the church, no spark thereof to be found, the light therof cleane put out, and vtterly extinct, before Luther start vp. And consequently they must needs also confesse, that the substance of their Church and religion was perished, which could not be without the soule, life, definition and summe thereof.

Only name of Christ remained

Protestats confesse that their church perished.

7. Neither do they lesse openly confesse that their Church was perished. For thus sayth Luther lib. de Captiu. Babylon, tom. 2. fol 76: *But now sayth being not spoken of, the Church is extinguished by infinite lawes of works, and ceremonies.* Respons. ad Catharin. fol. 140. after he had sayd that the Church *is conceiued, formed, borne, nourished and conserued only by the vocall word*, he addeth: *By the Pope and Papists the vocall ghospell being choaked and extinct, was silent through all the world.* Tom. 3. in psal. 27. fol. 285: *And now that common sort of preachers reprobate what propoſeth it to vs in the Church of the deeds of Saints, but some small works, vntill faith being extinguished there become nothing but heathenish superstition where once the Church of God was, the name only of the Church left, the substance quite lost.* In psalm. 22. fol. 332: *This day vnder the Popes dominion*

Extinguished.

Name only of the Church left.

there is not left one trace of the Church which appeares. And to. 6. in cap. 49. Genes. fol. 666: *The Pope hath extinguished & swallowed vp the Church.* Calvin Respons. ad Sadolet. pag. 132: *The matter came to that passe, that it was manifest and evident to the learned and vnlearned, that the true order of the Church then perished, the Kingdome of Christ was throwne downe, when this dominion* (of the Pope) *was erected.* 4. Institut. cap. 3. §. 4. after he sayd that Apostles, Euangelists, Prophets were instituted only for that tyme when Churches were to be set vp, or to be drawne from Moyses to Christ, he addeth: *In our tyme God raiseth apostles, or at least Euangelists. For there was need of such to reduce the Church from the reuolt of Antichrist.* The Frech Confession art. 31: *In our dayes the state of the Curch being interrupted, God raised vp some extraordinarily which might restore the decayed ruines of the Church.* Or as it is in the French copy: *In our dayes when the state of the Church was interrupted, God raised vp some after an extraordinary manner, that they might set vp the church a new which was in ruine and desolation.* But surely that church, which was in ruine and desolation, & so as it needed to be set vp a new, was substantially fallen. Danæus in lib. Augustini de hæresibus cap. 95: *About the yeare after Christs passion 574: The slaughter, plague and tyranny of the whole Church began, which afterward vtterly destroyed the Kingdome of Christ.* And lib. 3. de Eccles. cap. 8: *The Church was in banishment 150. yeares.* Aretius in locis part. 3. fol. 25. hauing sayd that Luther was immediatly sent of God, addeth: *God then vseth immediat vocation, when there is no Church founded, or hauing byn founded is so degenerated, that the only shadow of her remayneth.* Chassan. in locis lib. 2. de Eccles. pag. 151: *It is false that the Church shall neuer be broken of.* Sadeel. lib. de vocat. oftentyms sayth, that the Church was *corrupted, decayed, ouerthrowne, and her foundation shaken and* ouer-

The order of the Church perished.

Christs Kingdom throwne downe.

State of the church interrupted.

Church to be set vp a new.

Slaughter of the whole Church.

Kingdom of Christ vtterly destroyed.

No church or only shadow therof.

ouerturned. And p. 555, that to reſtore her we muſt do, as men vſe to do in renewing that building which is quite fallen. And in Refutat. Theſ. Poſnan. cap. 81 *VVhen Popiſh errours had poſſeſſed almoſt the whole world, nor there appeared openly true fruits of the Church, nay nor true leaues; we ſay the Church was in one or two.* Boyſſeul in Confutat. Spondæi pag. 742: *It is true that all the Church was corrupted, all adultereſſe, all Idolatreſſe.* Sohinus in Methodo Theol. pag. 212: *About the tyme of Gregory the great the Church degenerated more and more, vntill at laſt it loſt all purity and plainly fell to dotage, yea to madnes, and in the VVeſt ended in Popery, and in the Eaſt in Mahometiſme.* D. Whitaker Controuerſ. 2. queſt. 5. cap. 6. pag. 512: *As men do in a building fallen, that who will renew it buildeth not in the old foūdation becauſe it is looſed and not ſound, but layeth ſome new foūdation; ſo it was done in the renewing of the Church* (by Luther). Behold the old foundation of the Church put away, and a new layd. And pag. 510. he ſayth, that before Luther the ſtate of the Church was *fallen and quite ouerthrowne, and the church decayed & ouerturned.* And quæſt. 5. cit. pag. 528: *Luther tooke vpon him to reſtore religion corrupted.* And Controuerſ. 4. queſt. 5. cap. 12. pag. 683: *So at laſt the Curch was oppreſſed & extinguiſhed.* D. Fulke in his anſwere to a falſe Catholike pag. 35. *The true Church failed immediatly after the Apoſtles tyme.* D. Morton. Apol. part. 1. lib. 2. cap. 25. *Proteſtant miniſters were raiſed to ſet vp againe the Church being pitifully fallen.* The Apology of the Engliſh Church part. 4. cap. 9. diuiſ. 2: *For theſe men now after they haue left nothing remayning in the church of God that hath any likneſſe of his church, yet will &c.* Ibidem cap. 14. diuiſ. 1. & 2: *Long agoe haue the Biſhop of Rome willed to haue the whole church depend vpon himſelfe alone; wherefore it is no meruaile though it be cleane fallen downe long ago.* And part. 6. cap. 17. diuiſ. 2. &

The Church was in one or two.

A new foundatiō of the Church layd.

Nothing in the Church but pitiful ruines.

VVh

When we Christians saw, that all things were quite trodden vnder foot by these men, and that nothing remayned in the temple of God but pitifull spoiles and decayes, we reckoned it &c. M. Fox loc. cit: *The Church being degenerated from the Apostolike institution aboue all measure, reteining only the name of the Apostolike Church but farre from the truth thereof in very deed, did fal into al kind of extreme tyranny &c.* And M. Cartwright in D. Whitgifts defens. pag. 217: *When Antichrist had rooted out the Church euen from the ground.* Lastly Orbinus one of the foure false Apostles of England hath these words: *Considering how Christ by his wisedome, power, goodnes, had founded, builded, setled, his Church, with his bloud watched it, with his holy spirit enriched it, and at last seing it quite ouerthrowne, I could not but mervaile.*

The only name of the Apostolike Church rooted out from the ground

Coccius to. 1. pag. 983.

Quite ouerthrowne.

8. To these their plaine Confessions of the entire destruction of their Church we may add that commonly they say, that Elias the Prophet did think, that the Church had fayled in his tyme, and that besides himselfe there was no faythfull man or member of the Church. Luther lib. de Missa tom. 7. fol. 237: *Elias thought the whole church of God to haue byn extinct, that himselfe was left alone, and the only Christian.* Beurlin in Refutat. Soti cap: 53: *Elias complaineth before God, that besides himselfe there was neuer a Godly man remayning.* Lobechius disput. Theol. 10: *Elias thought the Church had holy perished.* Zuinglius lib. de vera & falsa relig. cap. de Euchar: *Elias thought that he was alone.* Peter Martyr in Rom. 11: *Elias thought that piety was perished, and that all Saincts were cut of in Israel.* Caluin in Antid. art. 18. Paris: *Elias thought himselfe alone to remaine of the Church.* And in Rom. cap. 11. v. 2: *He thought that in his nation religion and worship of God had perished. He condemned the whole nation besides himselfe of impiety. He imagined that he had byn left alone.* Keckerman lib. 3. System Theol. pag.

Protestats say that Elias thought the church was perished.

389: *Elias beleeued that he alone remayned of the people of Israel, who could be sayd to be actually a member of the true Church.* Lubbert lib. 6. cap. 3. *Elias thought that besides himselfe there remayned none who was truly turned to God.* Rivet. in Epitome Controuers. tract. 2. sect. 37: *Elias thought that he had remayned alone.* Vorstius in Antibellarm. pag. 134: *Elias thought that of the true worshippers of God he alone remayned.* Boysseul in Confutat. Spondæi pag. 247: *Elias thought that he was the whole Church of God.* Nay Polanus part. 3. Thes. de Eccles. sayth plainly in his owne person, that *the church failed in Elias his tyme.* The Apology of the English Church part. 4. cap. 12. diuis. 1. & 2. sayth: *Where was that Church then when Ely the Prophet so lamentably and bitterly made his mone, that only himselfe was left of all the whole world, who did duely and truly worship God?* And M. Iewel in Defe. Apol. part. 4. c. 4. diuis. 2. *Elias thought all the godly in Israel had byn slaine and not one left aliue.* D. Fulke ad Cauillat. Stapletoni: *It fell to Elias, that he seemed to be left alone of all the number of the Godly, which sincerely worshipped God.* M. Hooker in his 3. booke of Eccles. policy pag. 126: *He tooke it as though there had not byn remayning in the world any besides himselfe, that carryed a true and an vpright hart towards God, with care to serue him according vnto his holy will.* D. Sutcliffe lib. 1. de Eccl. cap. 6. pag. 95: *The church in Elias his dayes did seeme to him so destroyed, that he thought he had byn left alone.* D. Whitaker Cont. 2 quest. 3. cap. 3. pag. 476: *Elias thought the whole Church of the faythfull was perished in his tyme. Elias beleeued that none remayned besides himselfe. Elias thought that he alone was left a true worshipper of God.* And pag. 475: *Elias sayd that he was alone left the true seruant of God.* I dispute not now, how falsly they impose vpon Elias this blasphemous opinion of the church perishing or destruction, only I note, how vnder the name and authority

rity of that great Prophet, they teach that the church may perish, which sometymes they are ashamed to avouch in their owne names.

9. Moreover they teach, that the Church may consist of one or two, which is in effect and in other words to say, that it may perish. Luther lib. de notis Eccles. tom. 7. fol. 148: *This is called the Christian society, & it is necessary that there be alwayes such men in the world, albeit of them there be only two or three, or children alone.* Arcitius in locis part. 3. tol. 50: *Any number, though neuer so small, sufficeth to the Church for externall matters.* Iunius cont. 4. lib. 3. cap. 16: *Two men ordered towards God are a Church.* D. Whitaker cont. 2. quest. 3. cap. 3. pag. 474. *It is false, which he sayth, that two men cannot make a Church.* And pag. seq he graunteth that Protestants teach that *euch man is a seuerall Church.* And pag. 478: *If in the most sorturne tymes of the Church there be one or another faythfull seruant of God, it is enough.* Which also Bucanus saith loc. 41. de Eccles. sect. 14. Nay Luther in cap. 7. Gen. tom. 7. fol. 107. sayth: *If I were the only man in the whole world who did hold the word, I alone should be the church.* And Riuet. in Epitom. Cont. tract. 1. sect. 27. *The Church subsisteth in euery one of her members.* Finally they think, that their Church and religion shall not alwayes endure. For thus Luther writeth in cap. 2. Mathæi tom. 4. fol. 438: *We cannot comfort our selues so as the Papists do, with that consolation, that the Church shall not perish. For wheresoeuer we cast our eyes we are diuersly terrified, the furyes of Satan and the world is extreme, wherewith he endeauoureth to extinguish this doctrine. But the Popes boast, and that with full mouth, that the Church shall not perish.* In cap. 55. Isaiæ fol. 226: *There is danger least it shortly fall out, that the word be againe taken from vs.* Tom. 3. in psalm. grad. fol. 489. alias 508: *The Pope obstinately keepeth these promises, with-*

Protestats Church may consist of one or two.

Of any number.

Of two only.

If one or two.

Of one alone.

Protestats believe not the cōtinuāce of their Church.

which Christ did comfort his followers, that he would be with them to the end of the world. That S. Peters boat although it be in danger, shall neuer be drowned. But the true (Protestãt) *Church to which alone that was sayd, doth not so beleiue that, nor so cheare vp her selfe with the truste of those promises.* Kemnice in locis part. 1. tit. de Iustificat. pag. 216: *I often tremble that Luther oftentymes (I know not with what abode) repeateth those words, This doctrine after my death shall be darkened againe.* The Confession of Mansfeld: *It is euident what shall follow at length, to wit, a horrible destruction of pure doctrine, which suddenly we shall leese beyond all expectation.* The Magdeburgians Præfat. Cent. 5: *The reuealed truth is already perished, and that vpon the suddaine, what remayneth but vtter abolition of true religion?* Caluin in his Catechisme: *I am so doubtfull touching posterity, that I scarce dare thinke thereof.* Author Præfat. in Syntag. Confess: *We haue cause to feare, that matters will returne to the darkenesse of former tymes.* And Paræus in Miscellanea Vrsini pag. 39. sayth, that all good and wise men do easily perceiue, that there hangeth ouer their heads some dreadfull night and darckenesse. M. Iewell in his sermon in cap. 1. Aggæi: *This Ghospell which ye now loath, shall be taken from you.* D. Whitaker cont. 2 quest. 5. cap. 4. pag. 503: *That which he sayth that neither Lutherans nor Zuinglians nor Caluinists shall last euer, is vncertaine.* And lastly D. Morton part. 1. Apol. lib. 1. cap. 31. sayth: *Protestants say not, that their Church cannot faile*: Thus ye see that Protestants cannot comfort themselues that their Church shall not perish, that they do not beleiue that they shall not be drowned, that a horrible destruction and vtter abolition of their doctrine is to follow, that they dare scarce thinke of posterity, that it is vncertaine whether they are to last for euer, and that they beleiue not that their Church cannot faile.

Con-

Consider now diligently (good reader) First how not few but very many Protestant writers haue confessed that their Church and religion was then perished when Luther began, Secondly, that not obscure writers, but the most famous amongst them. Thirdly, that they haue not seldome confessed it, but oftentymes. Fourthly, that not in obscure or generall termes only, but in plaine and most particuler words. Lastly, that not only in their contentious writings against their aduersaries, or in their sermons to the people (in which speaches some vse to speake hyperbolicaly) but also in their most sober and temperate writings, as in those wherin they deliuer their doctrine or relate histories, in their commentaries vpon the scripture, in their Confessions of fayth, and in their speaches vnto God himself. Be it so, that one or two, or some few in heat of contention should haue hyperbolically sayd, that their church and religion was perished without meaning so. But that so many, and so great masters, so often, and in so many kinds of writings, so plainly and so particulerly, should say that their Church and religion was perished, and yet not meane so; cannot be sayd, vnlesse we will graunt that so many & so great Maisters of Protestants in so great a matter haue deceiued their Readers, and haue written one thinge and meant another, and that their meaning is not to be gathered out of their owne most frequent and most plaine words, vttered in all kinds of writings, but out of our fancie and pleasure. *VVhat* (as Tertullian sayth) *meane they otherwise then they write, masters of deceit not of truth?* Note. 1. 2. 3. 4. Scorp. c. 12.

10. If any demaund, how it came to passe, that Protestants should so often and so plainly say,

that their Church and religion was perished before Luther appeared, I answeare, that there were many causes thereof. First because it was so euident, that their Church and religion was not at all when Luther began, that (as themselues haue confessed) *they cannot deny it. It cannot be denyed. If any deny it he may be conuinced. All men must confesse it. The matter it selfe proclaimeth and proueth it. And finally that it is manifest both to learned and vnlearned.* Secondly, they sayd so for to moue men to hate the Pope and Papists, whome they affirmed to haue destroyed the fayth and Church. Thirdly, for to purchase the loue of the people, as who had restored to them againe the Church and Religion. Fourthly, they sayd so for to excuse their preaching and playing the Pastours without ordinary calling, as if forsooth when they began, there had byn no church which could giue them cõmission. Finally, as phrantike men so Protestants somerymes are in good fittes, in which they see and confesse the truth. But at other tymes when Catholiks out of this perishing and destruction of their Church and religion do inferre, that it is not the Church or religion of Christ, against which (as he hath promised) the gats of hell shall not preuaile, but some other Church & religion either first began by Luther, or else restored and renowed by him after that it was substantially perished and destroyed; then they mollify and glose their former sayings, deuise strange & violent senses of their words, and euery way seeke out shiftes and sleights whereby they may auoyd the force of their owne testimonies, which we shall rehearse and refute in the next chapter.

Wherfor Protestãts say their Church was perished.

1. Num. 1. 4. 5. 7.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Matth. 16.

The

The Protestants shiftes for to delude their foresayd Confessions touching the substantiall decay of their Church and Religion refuted.

CHAP. II.

1. ALBEIT the foresayd confessions of the Protestants touching the substantiall decay of their Church and religion before Luther arose, be so plaine and euident, as we may well say with Tertullian: *VVho will not acknowledge these rather then expound the?* Yet because the obstinacy of heretiks is so great, as it may be sooner ouercome then persuaded, & is wont to seek out all shifts to auoyd the force euen of their owne words, I will heare set downe their shifts and confute them. *De Resur. c. 21.*

2. Their first shift is, that the forenamed Protestants by the words of *fayth*, *religion*, and the like, when they say that they perished, did not meane the inward fayth of the heart, as if no man in his heart had held the Protestant fayth or religion, but only the outward profession thereof, and so meane only, that the outward profession of Protestancy was perished, or that none professed it. I graunt indeed, that somtyme they speake of outward profession of faith, but this commeth all to one purpose. Because the profession of faith can no more perish in the church, then the fayth it selfe, as hereafter we shall proue by the confessions of Protestants themselues. But that they speake not also of the inward fayth, or of fayth it selfe, is most false. First, because they say so without all proofe, neither can they proue it otherwise

their first shift.

That they say inward faith perished.

1.

then because perhaps the same Protestants haue e-
therwhere sayd the contrary, which kind of proofs
Lib. 2. c. 1. 2. we hereafter shew to be nothing worth. Againe it is
incredible, vnlesse one will believe what he list, that
by so many words of light, clarity, religion, worship of God,
Ca. 2. n. 2. 3. truth of God, sayth, true knowledge, knowledge of sayth, Chri-
stian sayth, knowledge of Christ, as they haue vsed and we
repeated, they meant not sayth it selfe, but only the
3. outward profession of faith. Besides, they sayd plain-
ly, That none believed to be iustified without workes. That the
doctrine of iustification by sayth, was blotted out of the memory
Cap. 1. nu. of men, that holesome truth perished from earth, and that it was
2. 3. 4. 5. 6 taken from men, that Christ was buryed and taken out of the
world and the Church, that all (Protestant) consolation was
vnknowne, that without Luther one iot had not byn knowne, that
the knowledge of Christ, the knowledge of sayth, sayled, and lest-
ly that Christ was not vnderstood but vtterly vnknowne. Which
words are manifestly spoken & meant of true or in-
ward sayth. I adde also, that it is a rule of ciuil law
Luther de abrog. mis. & epist. ad Amsd. Bebusselb. tom. 4. Catal. hæret. approued by Luther and Protestants, that who cold
speak clearely, and yet spake obscurely, should haue
his words expounded against him. Seeing therefore
Protestants could haue spoken farre more clearly, if
they had meant only that outward profession of faith
had perished, we may lawfully expound their words
against themselues.

3. To this shift is another like, wherewith
they say that the foresayd testimonies of Protestants
touching the destruction or decay of their Church
The secod shift. are not to be vnderstood of their inuisible Church,
which they say is the company of only true sayth-
full and predestinate men, but of the decay of their
visible Church, which they say is the company of al
those that professe true doctrine, and is the Church
not in

not in the sight of God, but only in the eyes of men. I do not deny, that sometymes they speake of the visible Church, notwithstanding (as before I sayd) it comes all to one purpose, because (as shall be proued hereafter) there can be no inuisible Church without a visible, nor a company of faythfull and predestinate men, but they must professe their fayth. But most false it is, that they speake not also of the true Church, which they will haue to be inuisible to any but to God alone. For first (as before I argued) this cannot be proued otherwise, then that perhaps the same men haue at other tymes sayd the contrary, which will proue, that they like lyers haue contradicted themselues, not, that they haue not sayd this, which they haue as clearly sayd, as euer they sayd any thing else. Besides, in saying (according to their meaning) that the Church hath not perished or cannot perish, they do not indeed cõtradict themselues, when they say that it hath or can perish. For when they say, that the Church cannot perish, by the name of the *Church*, they vnderstand not the Catholike Church, that is, the Church spread throughout the world: for (as we saw) they teach that the Church may consist or be reduced to one or two, and that Elias thought there was none of the Church but himselfe. Whereupon D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 3. pag. 608: findeth fault with Cardinall Bellarmine, *when he sayth that there is alwayes a visible Church, by the name of the Church he vnderstandeth not one or two, but a multitude,* Neither also do they by the name of the *Church*, when then say it cannot perish, vnderstand any true particuler Church consisting of a Pastour and flock, as is euident; both because they say the Church may be reduced to one or two, as also because (as shall here-

The Protestats say the true Church hath perished. 1.

2.

Capel. 8.

after appeare) they thinke that all Pastors may perish; and lastly because D. Whitaker loc. cit. reprehendeth Bellarmine for that by the *name of the Church which cannot faile, he vnderstandeth a multitude gathered together, in which are Prelates and subiects.* They are therefore of opinion, that both the Catholike Church spred through out the world, and euery particuler church consisting of Prelates and subiects, may faile and perish; and when they say the Church cannot faile, by the name of the Church, they vnderstand fayth; and meane, that there shall alwayes be fayth in some one or other, as clearly appeareth by their former words, and also by these of D. Whitaker loc. cit. pag. 469: *Hence he gathereth, not as our aduersaries do, that the visible Church shall neuer faile, but that fayth shall neuer faile in the whole, but that to the end of the world Christian religion shal remayne in some. This* (sayth he) *is the very thing which we say & maintaine.* Yee see plainly, that when they say the church cannot faile, they only meane that fayth cannot vtterly faile, but that it shall be alwayes in some. Wherein there is no contradiction to that which otherwise they teach, that the Church can faile, because fayth and the Church are different things; neither doth fayth in whome soeuer, and in how few soeuer, make the Church. Wherefore if they be mad men and no Christians, who say that the Catholike Church may faile, or that the Church is not to dure for euer (as D. Whitaker himselfe sayth cap. 1. & 2. cit.) certainly these Protestants are such. For whiles they say, that the Church may be brought to one or two, and that all Pastors may perish; they manifestly say indeed and effect, that both the Catholike and all kind of true Churches may faile. Moreouer I proue, that they meane that the true Church was perished,

Cap. 7.

What Protestats meane by the church whē they say it cannot perish.

3.

perished, because they think that he is made by inward fayth; but this they affirme to haue perished, as euen now appeared. Besides, the very name of the Church properly signifieth the true Church, and only improperly that which is not the true Church. And therefore when it is simply and absolutely put, it ought to be taken for the true Church; which thing also themselues do teach. For thus writeth Sadeel in Refutat. Thes. Posnan. cap. 4. pag. 827: *When the Church is simply put, or when it is sayd the Church of Christ, it properly signifieth only the elect.* Hereupon also Kemniee in loc. tit. de Eccles. cap. 3. defineth the Church *to be the Catholike company*. But the Catholike company is the true Church, as is euident by the Creed, where we professe to belieue the Catholike Church, and is confessed by D. Whitaker Contr. 2. quest. 1. cap. 2. & 5. by D. Morton Apol. part. 1. l. 1. cap. 13. by Lubbert lib. 1. de Eccl. cap. 4. by the French Catechisme Domin. 13. and others. And therefore most rightly saith S. Augustin, that *it is a wicked, impudent, detestable, and abominable speach to say the Church hath perished*; which yet would not be, vnlesse by the name of the Church were vnderstood the true Church. For what offence were it to say, that the false Church had perished? Furthermore, when heretikes as the Donatists, Seruetus, and the like, do say that *the Church was perished or banished*, the Protestants themselues vnderstand the of the true Church; why then ought not Protestants to be vnderstood in the same manner, when they vse the same words? Againe, because sometymes they say, that *the Kingdome of Christ, the temple of God hath perished*. But what can be the Kingdome of Christ and temple of God, but the true Church, for the false is rather the Kingdome and temple of Satan? Where-

4.

De vnic. Bapt. c. 14. Conc. 2. in Psal. 101.

Calu. cont. Seruet. pa. 657. Whitak. Cont. 2. q. 3. c. 2. & 3.

Cap. 1. n. 7.

upon

upon D. Whitaker Controuers. 2. quæst. 3. cap. 1. pag. 466. sayth: *The scriptures most plainly teach, that there shall be no end of the Kingdome of Christ.* And ad Demonstrat. 17. Sanderi: *What other thing is the temple of God, but the Church of Christ, which is built with liuely stones?* And M. Powell lib. 1. de Antichristo cap. 3: *The Church is described 1. Tim. 3. to be the temple of God.* Hereto we may add, that Ochim sayth, that that Church *which Christ founded, washed with his bloud, & enriched with his holy spirit,* (which vndoubtedly is the true Church) *was vtterly destroyed.* Finally because they say, that Elias thought that there was not remayning one pious man besides himselfe, that he was the only Christian, the only true worshipper of God, which was left aliue, and actuall member of the true Church. Seing therfore they will make Elias to thinke so of the true church, of the same also ought themselues to be vnderstood, who vse to draw arguments out of Elias his words; especially when as they say, that it sufficeth if there be one or two faythfull men in the most forlorne tymes of the Church, which they must needs meane of the true Church which they will haue to consist only of the faythfull seruants of God.

Num. 8.

That they meane of the vniuersall Church.

4. Their third shift may be, that when they speake of the destruction of the Church, they meane not of the vniuersall or whole Church, but of some particuler, or part of the Church. But this is easily refuted. First because (as we haue rehearsed) they say *there was a slaughter of the whole Church, that all the Church was corrupted, all became idolatrous, that scarce the name of Christianity was left, that none beleeued, that not one iot of the ghospell had byn knowne without Luther, that the whole knowledge of Christ, all pure worship, all true religion was abolished.* Secondly because vnder the name of Elias they plainly say,

ly say, that *the whole Church was extinct, the whole Church failed, he alone was a faythfull man, and onely member of the true Church.* Wherefore either they thinke it not blasphemy to say the whole Church hath perished, or this horrible blasphemy which calleth in question all religion, they most impiously attribute to that holy Prophet. Thirdly, because they say that their Church *was brought to one or two, and that it is inough to the Church, if there be one or two faythfull persons.* But what man well in his wittes will say, that one or two are inough to make the Catholike or vniuersall church. Finally, this shall yet more appeare out of the chapter following, where we shall see, that they teach that the whole world did fall from the fayth. Mat. 24.

That they meane of a substantiall perishing.

5. Their fourth shift is, that by the words *Destruction, decaying, failing, ouerthrowing*, and such others, they meane not a substantiall perishing of the fayth or Church, but only an accidentall corruption or becomming worse. But this shift also is soone refuted. First because Luther sayth of his fayth, doctrine or ghospell, that it *dyed, was neglected, ouerwhelmed, extinct, blotted out, taken away, ouerthrowne, lost, abolished, forgotten, and rooted out.* And that he might put it out of all doubt, that by these words he meant a true and substantiall destruction or perishing, he added vnto them most significant aduerbes, saying that it *was truly ouerwhelmed, wholy extinct, vtterly extinct, extinct from the bottome, plainly extinct, plainly taken away, simply taken away, quite taken away, vtterly buryed, vtterly lost, wholy abolished, and blotted out, and most plainly rooted out.* And least any one might also cauill that these words are not meant of a true and substantiall destruction, he lyd further, that the *Pope hath obscured, may extinguished the doctrine of fayth: They haue darckned, may wholy ouerwhelmed*

1. Cap. 1. n. 1.

Ib.

med Christs Ghospell: They haue not only obscured, but absolutely taken away the ghospell. Surely (as S. Augustin sayth) such kind of words needs no Expositor but only a reader. In like sort other Protestants say of their fayth or ghospell, that it was banished, cast out, extinct, ended, choaked, buryed, obscured till it was vtterly extinguished, that it perished from the earth, and vanished out of the Church. They add also, that it was wholy ouerturned, vtterly extinct, quite changed into idolatries, ouerturned from the root, and that there was an vtter abolition, an extreme falling away, and full destruction of it, so that not so much as one litle sparke could be found, but it was quite extinct, & scarce the name of Christianity was left.

Lib. vide peccat. mer. c. 4.

Num. 21.

6. Besides of their principall and most fundamentall article of Iustification by only fayth they say, that lay long vnknowne, that there was profound silence of it, that no man taught it, that it was neglected, lost, blotted out, extinct, and horribly oppressed, that it was corrupted, nay extinct and abolished, that no man believed it, that it was vtterly extinct, plainly lost, quite lost, wholy suppressed, wholy oppressed, wholy trampled, wholy dasht out, vtterly blotted out, quite extinct, quite taken away, quite neglected and blotted out of the memory of men, and not only obscured but quite extinguished. But if this doctrine were so extinct as no man believed it, and blotted out of mens memory, surely not only the Profession of their fayth but also their fayth it selfe was vtterly perished; and consequently also their Church, whereof this article is the life, soule, summe, definition, and all.

T. 1. n. 4. 5. 6.

Num. 7.

7. Of the Church also they say, that it was banished, fayled, was oppressed, extinct, ouerturned, fallen, wholy fallen, that it fell to Antichrist, that the old foundation thereof was removed, and a new layd, that the order of the Church perished, that there was a slaughter of the whole Church, that Christs Kingdome was throwne downe & razed to the ground, that

that in the temple of God there was nought but pitifull ruines, that the Church was from the foundation rooted out and ouerthrowne by the ground, and that where it once was there remayned only the name, the substance being quite lost. Surely either by these manner of speaches is signified a substantiall destruction, or that cannot be plainly signifyed by any manner of words. Besides the formes of speach do more clearly signify a substantial destruction, the those which Protestants condemne in some heretiks. For Caluin lib. cont. Seruetum pag. 657. condemneth Seruet for saying, that *there had byn a long banishment of the Church from the earth, and that she had byn driuen out of the world*. And yet as we see Danæus sayth, that *the Church was banished*. Powell, that *all true religion was banished*. D. Fulke, that *the true doctrine of saluation was driuen out*. And Crispin, that *all true worship of God was driuen out* D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 3. cap. 3. pag. 471. and otherwhere, condemneth the Donatists and other Heretikes for saying, that *the Church perished*; and yet Bale sayth that holesome *truth perished from the earth*. And Lobechius vnder Elias his name, that *the Church quite perished*. Moreouer they say, that the Church may be reduced to one or two, which is indeed to say that the Church may substantially perish, for the Church is defined to be a company or multitude in the English Confession article 19. in the French art. 27. in the Suitzers art. 17. and in the Flemish art. 27. But one or two are not a company. Whereupon Danæus lib. 3. de Eccles. cap. 16. sayth: *It is written of Vlpian the Lawyer in the ciuill law, that at least three persons are required to make a Colledge*; and if to a Colledge much more to the Church. And Lubbert lib. 2. Replicat. cap. 3. sayth plainly, *that one man makes not a Church*. And Polanus in Syntag. lib. 7. cap. 1: *One man, though neuer so*

Num. 8. That the Church cannot consist of one.

he

holy, cannot be a church. Beurlin also in Refut. Sotil. Ribad. Whether do we call the solitude of one man, which worshippeth God, the Church. And D. Whitaker. lib. 1 de Scriptura cap. 11. Sect. 4. *How can the Church be in one, seeing the very name of the Church doth signify a company or multitude? If therefore there be but one, there is no Church. For the Church cannot be imagined to be but in many.* And much lesse can one or two be the Catholike Church, that is (as the Protestants themselues expound it) the Church spred throughout the whole world, because one or two cannot be spred throughout the world. Whereupon the Scots in their Confession cap. 18. say, that *two or three make not the vniuersall Church.* And Zuinglius lib. de vera & falsa relig. tom. 2. fol. 192: *Who sayes that the Church signifieth some few, erreth, like to him who sayth that people signifieth the King.* Surely it should be a notable flock which consisted of one or two sheep, a worthy Kingdome which had but one or two subiects, and a strange Catholike or vniuersall Church which contayned but one or two faythfull persons. What? can the gates of hell prevaile so farre against the Church, as they can reduce her to one or two Christians? What other thing is this, then to say that the Church can perish? For seing the Church cannot be imagined but in company or multitude, who sayth that the Church can be brought to one or two, doth indeed say the Church can be destroyed.

Buel. Defens. Sanct. part. 2. c. 1. Fulk. de Succes. p. 80. Bera de Eccl. c. 5. Brent. in Prolog. q. 4.

8. If any reply, that S. Augustin vpon the 128. psalme sayth that the Church *was once in Abel alone*, and Tertullian. lib. de pœnit. cap. 10. *the Church is in one or two*; I answere, that S. Augustin there by the Church vnderstandeth those only, whome the scriptures by name hath canonized, as it hath Abel; for otherwise it is manifest, that in Abels time, there

were

were others that were of the Church besides himselfe, to wit Adam and Eue. And Tertullian by the Church vnderstandeth, not the Catholike or vniuersall Church as we do, but any number of Christians, such as were those domesticall Churches, which S. Paul sometymes saluted.

9. The last refuge may be, that what Protestants haue sayd of the destruction of the Church and fayth, they meant not of their owne Church and fayth, but of some others. But this is a fond shift. For first, as I haue shewed, they meane the destruction of the true Church and fayth. Eyther therefore their Church and fayth is not the true but false, or else they meane of their owne. For the true Church and fayth is but one, as the Apostle sayth Ephes. 4: *One God, one fayth.* And the Nycen Creed: *I believe one church.* S. Cyprian lib. de vnit: *One God, one Christ, one Church, and one fayth.* S. Hilary ad Constant: *Whatsoeuer is besides one fayth, is not fayth but treachery.* And S. Leo serm. 4. de Natiuit: *Vnlesse it be one it is no fayth.* Nay Luther lib. cont. Papatum tom. 7. fol. 461: *Christ knoweth not two kinds of vnlike Churches, but one only Church.* Caluin 4. Inst. cap. 1. §. 2: *We cannot find two or three churches vnlesse Christ be pinckt in peeces.* And in his Catechisme: *As there is one head of the faythfull, so they must all be vnited in one body, that there be not many Churches, but one only.* And hereupon inferreth Sadeel in Refutat. Thes. Posnan. art. 61. that *what is sayd of the true Church, is sayd of theirs. Seeing* (sayth he) *the true Church is one and not many, as often as the truth of doctrine shineth openly, so often we say the true Church and their owne Church was visible.* Secondly because (as we haue seene) they speake of the destruction of their most principall article of iustificatiō by only faith, which they affirme to be the life, soule, and summe of their

Church. Thirdly because they ordinarily speake of the destruction of the Ghospell: but by the name of the Ghospell they meane their owne doctrine, as by the name of Gospellers they vnderstand themselues, as hereafter shall appeare. Finally, because they professe that by the name of a Protestant, Lutheran, or Caluinist they vnderstand a true Christian. Sadeel lib. de peccat. remiss. cap. 1: *Ours, that is the true Christian Catholike opinion.* D. Fulke lib. de Succes. pag. 186: *I will neuer deny that Iewell was a noble Protestant, that is a Christian.* And ad Cauillat. Staplet: *The community of Christians, whome ye call Protestants.* Hutten in Expostul. cum Erasmo: *Against Lutherans, that is maintayners of the truth.* Schusselburg. tom. 7. Catal. hæret. Pap. 73: *A Lutheran or true Christian, is &c.* And lib. 2. Theol. Caluin. fol. 131: *Lutherans, that is true seruants of Christ.* Beza cont. Illyricum pag. 168: *We perceiue no difference betweene Sacramentaries and Christians.* Hospinian part. 2. Histor. fol. 384: *The Sacramentaries, that is the orthodoxall.* And Danæus cont. Bellarm. pag. 311: *The Caluinists, that is Christians.* pag. 169: *A Caluinist, that is, a godly man.*

10. Wherefore out of all which hath byn sayd in this and the former Chapter, I thus make my first demonstration to proue that Luther was the Author and first beginner of the Protestant Church and religion. *If the Protestant Church were not at all when Luther began, he was the author thereof: But it was not at all: Therefore he was the author of it.* The Maior or first proposition is euident. For if it were not at all when Luther began, he was the beginner of it. The minor is manifest by the foresayd Cōfessions of Protestants wherein they plainly say, that it was substantially perished.

That euery man followed a Church and religion different from the Protestant before Luther arose.

CHAP. III.

1. THE second demonstration wherewith we will proue Luther to haue byn haue byn the Author of the Protestant Church and religion we will take from the Protestants confessions, that whē Luther first began all the world and euery man imbraced a different religion. Luther in the Preface of his first tome: *Here see euen by my case, how hard it is to get out of errours which are confirmed by the example of the whole world, and by long custome as it were changed into nature.* And to.2. this is written in his Epitaph: *O Christ, be shewed the when all the world was ouerwhelmed with darkenesse.* And in lib.1. de captiuit. Babylon. fol. 72. being to write against Masse, he sayth: *Neither let it moue thee, that the whole world hath the contrary opinion and custome.* And tol. 68: *There is almost this day nothing more receiued or more settled in the Church, then that Masse is a sacrifice.* Against: *I set vpon a thing, which being approued by the custome of so many ages and consent of all, is so ingrafted, as it is needfull to change almost the whole face of the Church.* And lib. de abrog. Miss. fol. 244: *How often did my trembling hart quake, and notwithstanding me obiected that their strongest and only argument: Art thou only wise, what did all erre, were so many ages ignorant?* Behold how Luthers heart or conscience did tell him that he alone knew Protestancy, and that for many ages all were ignorant of it. And in his Table talkes, tol. 10: *These cogitations were very troublesome*

the whole world.

Long custome.

So many ages

Consent of all.

Only Luther wise.

to me: Thou only hast the pure word of God, all others want it. And lib. cit. de Missa fol. 247: *The common people without doubt are most fully perswaded, that all men are holpen by Masses, for it seemeth incredible, that all the world should be so forsaken of God.* And fol. 256: *It seemes incredible to them, that Luther alone should be wise.* Contra Cochlæum fol. 408: *The Sophisters and Monks have seduced the whole world to trust in works.* Tom. 3. in psal. 82. fol. 481: *In tymes past the whole world was vnder the Popes Dominion.* Tom. 5. in 4. Galat. fol. 388: *In former ages Paul was vnknown to the whole world.* Tom. 6. in cap. 11. Genes. fol. 130: *The wicked impostour* (so he termeth the Pope) *hath deceived all the word.* In c. 37. fol. 506: *The whole world was horribly brought into madnes and folly by Papists.* In cap. 19. fol. 238: *In the former age all things lay in darknesse.* Tom. 7. epist. ad D. Sabaudiæ fol. 483: *We confesse that the world was by the Pope most miserably seduced & ensnared in those traditions of men, but rather snares of the devill, whiles all were perswaded that in keeping them they obtayned salvation, in omitting them fell into damnation.* And serm. de Simulacris fol. 277: *All the world was filled with the other abuse of images: For who would* (haue put images in Churches) *if thereby he had not thought that he did service to God.* Thus much Luther.

The whole world vnder the Pope.

2. And in like manner speake the Lutherans. The Confession of Auspurg. cap. 20: *No man admonished of the difference betwixt humane traditions and Gods law, no man taught how good works did please.* The Magdeburgians Præfat. Centur. 5: *All alike were drowned in the impieties and Aegiptian darknesse of Antichrist.* And Præfat. Centur. 8: *Antichrist had brought vnder his yok all Europe that we may* (say they) *speake nothing of other parts of the earth.* Melancthon tom. 4. Prefat. in Act. Ratisbon. pag. 730: *Only Luther durst touch the errours of the Popes & schoole. Our Churches follow him rather then the consent of so many ages.*

All alike.

All Europe.

Pa-

Popes and schooles. Lobechius disput. 29: *The Romane tyranny hath ouerwhelmed the Church and held the Christian world in thraldome.* Huber. in Antibellarm. lib. 4. cap. 3. *Our Church hath a new forme not vsed at that tyme when the Pope possessed all.* Morgestern tract. de Eccles. pag. 145: *The whole Christian world knoweth that before Luther all churches were ouerwhelmed with more then Cymmerian darknesse.* Hitherto the Lutherans. The Christian world. All churches.

3. Amongst the Sacramentaries Caluin 2. Institut. cap. 2. §. 4: *All, euen to the common people are embued with this principle that man hath free will.* Lib. 4. cap. 18. §. 18: *The Abomination of Masse profered in a golden cuppe hath made so drunke all Kings and people of the earth from the highest to the lowest that they put the whole hope of their saluation in it alone.* Which very words are repeated by Lobechius disput. 26. and by Hospin. epist. dedicat. 1. part: Histor. and part. 2. fol. 25. And the sayd Calvin lib. 4. cit. cap. 10. §. 5: *The whole world was couered with a most thick mist of ignorance.* And lib. de Cœn. pag. 10: *VVith how thick a mist of darknes was the world beseiged.* Againe: *VVhen Luther began to teach he so handled the matter of the supper, as that, what belongeth to the corporall presence, he seemed to leaue such as all then receiued.* And lib. de Nec. ff. Reform. pag. 46: *It is manifest that the whole world was bewitched with these wicked opinions before Luther appeared.* And Respons. ad Sadolet. pag. 130: *All things were infect with pernicious errours. There was none which truly esteemed that only sacrifice (of Christ) none which so much as dreamed of his eternall Priesthood and the intercession which dependeth thereupon, none rested in his only iustice. But now whereas all did put their trust in good works when they went about by good words to purchase thy (God he speaketh to) grace, to obtaine iustice, to purge their sinnes, to satisfy thee. All which (sayth he) do dash out and annihilate the vertue of the crosse of* All euē to the common people. Al people on earth from the highest to the lowest. The whole world. No mā so much as dreamed of &c.

christ. Respons. ad Vet. pet. pag. 354: Seing the whole Westerne Church as he calles it defendeth obstinately all the impiety which we iustly detest &c. And epist. 141: We are compelled to make a separation from the whole world. Bucer lib. de vi & vsu Ministerij pag. 602: It is plaine, that for many ages past God reuealed to no nation the doctrine of our saluation, and all things belonging to his Kingdome so farre as he hath don in our age: Lib. de Concord. pag. 660: This error of the reall presence preuailed with all Nations of the whole world. Danæus lib. de Antichristo cap. 26: At length Antichrist and his doctrine ouercame, all men holding their peace & shamefully and basely submitting themselues vnto him vntill Iohn Vi. in last arose who stoutly opposed himself against him. Sicidan epist. dedicat. Histor: The beginning (of Protestancy) was slender and almost contemptible, and one only bare the brunt and brunt of the whole world. Bibliander Orat. ad Principes Germ: We put it as a thing knowne by it self most cleare and out of all doubt, that after Gregory the great his death the Pope of Rome was Antichrist, who with his abom nations blasphemies and idolatries did so beset all Kings and people from the first to the last, that they became more blockish then brute beasts Zuinglius lib. de vera & falsa relig. cap. de Euchar: I think no man will deny this that we all ran to masse as to a sacred refuge. Daniel Camier. epist. 49: Errour possessed not one or two small parcels, but Apostasy turned the very whole body away from Christ. Hospin. Præfat. part. 2. Histor: From Gregories tyme no man stroue against superstition, but all added and put to what strength each one could. And ep. dedicat. part. 1: This most grosse and more then Cymmerian darknesse endured in the whole Christian world the space of 6. hundred years last past. Viretus in Hospin. part. 2. fol. 224: The whole Christian Nation vtterly bewitched as it were with sorceries and alienated from God and true religion &c. Præt. Syntag. Confess: When all was couered with most gross dark-

All the westerne Church.

One only man.

All people from the first to the last.

The whole body of Christendome.

None stroue against.

The whole Christian Nation.

darkenesse of ignorance and idolatry. Gualter. Præfat. Comment. Epist. ad Rom: *In the point of the reall presence the whole Christian world was greatly deceiued.* And Præfat. in tom. 2. Zuinglij: *The whole world was before bewitched with trust in outward signes.* Iezler de bello Euchar. fol. 24: *The former age was euery where drowned in most thick darkenesse which no man in his witts can deny.* Brocard in c. 2. Apocal. fol. 41: *When the preaching of the ghospell was allowed in Luther and his first onset against the Papacy, the knowledge of Christ was found missing in all and euery of his members.* Al & euery mẽber of Christ.

4. Amongst our English Protestants thus speaketh the Author of the Apology of the English Church pag. 38: *We are indeed departed from him, who we saw had blinded the world for many ages.* His Maiesty in his Monitory epistle pag. 37: *In those ages a thicker and more blind ignorance of truth possessed the world.* Pag. 100: *How many ages was the Christian people held in so great blindnes and ignorance of holesome doctrine.* And pag. 160: *A darck night of Popish doctrine possessed the world.* D. Whitaker Cont. 2. q. 3. pag. 467: *The plague (of Popery) at last went through the whole world.* Pag. 468: *That Antichristians plague raged through all parts of the world, and through all visible Churches.* And Cont. 4. quæst. 5. cap. 3. pag. 684: *In tymes past no religion had place in Churches but Papisticall.* D. Humfrey ad Rat. 3. Campiani: *At length all lest the fellowship of the Church.* M. Perkins in Exposit. Symboli: *During the space of 900. yeares the Popish heresy spred it selfe ouer the whole world.* And D. White in his way pag. 352. compareth Popery before Luthers tyme to a leprosy, which (sayth he) *possesseth euery part of man.* And in his defence cap. 37. he sayth: *I affirme Papacy to be a leprosy breeding in the Church so vniuersally, that there was no visible company of people appearing to the world free from it. And when-*

ther any company at all, knowne or vnknowne were free from it wholy or not, I neither determine, nor greatly care. M. Iewel serm. in cap. 11. Lucæ pag. 208: *When all the world the people Priests and Princes were ouerwhelmed with ignorance, when the word of God was put out of sight: when all schooles, Priests, Bishops, & Kings of the world were sworne to him* (the Pope) *that whatsoeuer he tooke in hand they should vphold it: When whosoeuer had muttered against him, must straight way haue lyn excommunicate & put to most cruel death as Gods enemy.* M. Fox in his Acts p. 391: *All the whole world was filled and ouerwhelmed with errors and darknesse.* And finally D. Bancroft in his surucy c. 4. pag 60. hath these words: *Both the Priests of all sortes and likewise the people became in tyme to be so drowned in the puddles of Popery, all of them together from the toppe to the toe, forgetting &c.*

Al people from the toppe to the toe.

5. By these confessions of Protestants we see plainly, that *all the westerne Church, all Europe, all Christian Churches, the whole Christian nation, the whole body of the Church, the whole world, all, all without exception, all alike, all euen to the Last, all euen to the common people, all Kings and people from the first to the last, all Priests and people from top to toe, all and euery one were ouerwhelmed with Papish and more then Cymmerian darknesse.* Secondly we see, that *no man stroue against Popery, no man admonished, no man taught, no man beleeued, no man so much as dreamed of that which is the cheifest and most principall point of Protestancy, but one only, and Luther alone was wise.* Thirdly that the case was such *for so many ages, for 600. yea for 900. years last past.* Fourthly that it is so manifest, that as themselues confesse the *whole Christian world knoweth it, it is confessed, manifest by it selfe, most cleare, and out of all doubt, and no man in his wittes can deny it.* To all which if you add, that very many, and most famous Protestants, oftentymes, most plainly, most freely, and in all kind

of

of writings haue confessed this, ye shall most euidently perceiue, that vnlesse it be *heretical licence* (as Tertullian speaketh) *or by some diuelish priuiledge* (as S. Augustins word is) their confessions can be vnderstood in no other sense, then that when Luther began, there was not one Protestant in the whole world. Lastly we see hereby, that Protestants herein imitate the phrases of old heretiks: for Manichee as S. Augustin writeth sayd: *Almost all nations are ignorant how the truth is.* And the Donatists: *The Church is perished from the whole world.* The Luciferians in S. Hierome: *The whole world is become Diuels.* Whose damned speach sayth he, *doth frustrate the Passion of Christ.* Nestorius in Vincent. Lyrin. auouched. *That the whole Church had erred.* And other heretiks there say, *Learne true sayth which besides vs none vnderstandeth, which lay hid for many ages and now of late is reuealed and shewed.* Marcion also and Valentinian in Tertullian auouch, that all had erred, at whome he pleasantly iesteth in these words: *For sooth the truth which was to be freed expected some Marcionists or Valentinians* (Lutherans or Caluinists.) *In the meane tyme men preached amisse, beleiued amisse, so many thousands we wrongly Christened, so many works of sayth wrongly done, so many miracles so many graces done amisse, so many Priesthoods so many functions wrongly executed.*

Lib. 1. cont. marc. ca. 3. de carne Chr. c. 3. li. 22 cont. Faust. c. 15

Cont. epist. fund. c. 4.

Heref. 69.

Dial. cont. Lucifer.

Cap. 26.

Praef. c. 28.

6. If any say that the scripture sometyme speaketh vniuersally when notwithstanding it is not to be vnderstood vniuersally, as when it sayth: *All seeke their owne: There is not one that doth good, no not one,* and the like, and therefore though the foresayd speaches of Protestants be vniuersall, yet they are not to be vnderstood vniuersally: I answeare, that it is found to affirme, that the foresayd speaches of Protestants ought to be vnderstood according to certaine

speaches of the scripture, and those spoken of other matters, rather then according to their own plaine and manifest signification. Who made this law of expounding Protestants words? Or do they keepe in expounding Catholiks or other mens wordes? God may speake in scripture as he thinkes best, Protestants ought according to custome, (which as is sayd is the law and rule of speach) both to speak and to be vnderstood. Besides, sith we know, that the scripture cannot lye or gainsay it selfe, and in other places it sayth the contrary, we iustly limitate its vniuersall speaches in this or that place. And therfore vnlesse Protestants can shew that they haue the like priuiledge that they cannot contradict themselues as the Scripture hath, there is no reason to expound them according as we do the holy Scripture.

7. If any reply that also Saint Hierome Dial. cont. Lucifer. sayd that the *whole world mervayled how it was become Arian*, and yet meant not that the whole world was Arian? I answeare, that Saint Hieromes example doth nothing availe Protestants. First because Saint Hierome sayd once so, Protestants very often. Againe, he sayd so only in heat of dispute with his aduersary; Protestants haue written so when they disputed with none. Besides, Saint Hierome in the very same place expoundeth himselfe, that he meant not that indeed the whole world was become Arian: For he sayth, that it *was euident that the Bishops were no Arians, but beleiued a right and abode in the agreement of fayth*, but only speaketh so because all the Bishops assembled at Arimini yelded to the Arians, that the word Consubstantiall should not be vsed. But Protestants say not that all the world yelded to the Pope about the suppressing of

one

one only word, but that all from the first to the last, from the top to the toe were drowned in Popish errours, and none believed or so much as dreamed of that which is most fundamentall and necessary in Protestant religion: Which kind of speaches S. Hierome never vsed. Againe, Saint Hierome vsed only this phrase: *The whole world*, but Protestants vse both that and many more and more plaine. Lastly albeit Saint Hierome had spoken altogether as Protestants do, yet there were no reason that they should be vnderstood rather according to Saint Hieromes meaning, then according to their owne most proper, most plaine, and most frequent words, especially when as Luther sayth tom. 1. fol. 414: *Many thinges are borne withall in the Fathers, who were knowne to be erthodoxe, which we may not imitate.*

8. Wherefore out of all which hath byn rehearsed in this chapter I thus frame my second demonstration: *If so be that before Luther arose there were not one only Protestant in the whole world, but that all & euery man followed a different Religion, Luther was the Author and beginner of the Protestant Church and Religion. But that is true, as manifestly appeareth by the manyfold and open confessions of Luther and many and most famous Protestants. Therefore &c.*

That

That Protestants confesse their Church and religion to haue byn altogeather inuisible before Luther appeared.

CHAP. IV.

1. THE fourth demonstration, wherewith we will proue Luther to haue byn the Author of the Protestant church and religion we will draw out of that which they confesse of the inuisibility thereof before Luther brake out. And by the way I must aduertise the Reader of two things. The one is, that by the name of the Church is not to be vnderstood only the men who are of the Church, but their society in religiō wherby they make a church. wherefore those Protestants speake not to the purpose, who to excuse the absurdity of their doctrine touching the inuisibility of the Church, say they meane not, that the men, whereof it consisted, were inuisible men; for it sufficeth, that they confesse, that they were inuisible worshippers of God, according to the Protestant manner; or that their society in this kind of worship of God was inuisible. The other point is, that in these kind of questions: *VVhether before Luther the Protestant Church were? VVhether it were visible? VVhither it had Pastors?* and the like: the Catholiks hold the negatiue part, and Protestants the affirmatiue, and that it belongeth to the affirmer, to proue what he affirmeth: wherein if he faile, he is ouercome: and it is not needfull for the denyer to proue his denyall, but is sufficient reasonably to answere the proofes of the affirmer; which if he performe, he hath

Note.

Colloq. Rabisbon. Sess. 2. c. 10. 17. Iuel. Def. Apol par. 3. c. 15. d. 1.

hath wonne the cause. As if one like Anaxagoras would say, that there were many worlds besides this: or that such and such things haue byn done in tymes past; he were bound to proue what he sayth, & he that should deny such matters, were not bound to proue his denyall, but only reasonably to answere his aduersaries arguments. And the reason is manifest, because for to affirme or beleiue any thinge, we must haue reason or proofe thereof: but for the not beleiuing of it, we need no other reason, then to shew that there is no sufficient reason why it should be beleiued. Hereupon Luther in his booke against Henry 8. King of England tom. 2. fol. 340 sayd: *He must be taught the principles of disputation, who hauing to proue his affirmation, vrgeth his aduersary to proue his denyall.* And Vorstius in his Antibellarm. pag. 464: *It is inough for the denyer, probably to deny.* Wherefore in these kind of questions Protestants ought to be vrged to performe their part, that is, to proue what they affirme, to wit, that before Luthers tyme their Church was, had Pastors, and the like: which if they cannot do, they must needs confesse, that in this debate they haue lost their cause. And they ought not to presse vs to proue, that before Luther their Church was not, had not Pastors &c. Because (as I sayd) herein we are only the defenders and denyers, and therefore it sufficeth for vs to shew, that no reasons, which the Protestants alledge conuince a reasonable man to beleiue that there was any such Church before Luther appeared: which if we do, we haue wonne the cause. Neuertheless, (that I may vse Luthers words in the booke before cited) *albeit it belong not to vs to proue the negatiue, let vs do it.*

Tom. 1. fol. 380. 471.

That the Protestãts Church was inuisible to strangers,

2. First therefore, touching the inuisibility of

of the Protestant Church before Luthers tyme, Protestants confesse, that it was inuisible to Papists, & enemies, to the world, and to all that were not of it. For thus sayth Sadeel in his Refutation of the 61. article pag. 538: *We deny not that the Godly men lurcked vnder Popish darknesse; and we giue God thanks, that such persons, families, and companies, were for a tyme inuisible and vnknown to the Pope and all his Catchpoles, seing they were for a long tyme like sparckles couered with much ashes.* The same he sayth in his answere to Arthur cap. 8. and to the Sophismes of Turrian loco 10. and to the Repetition of them pag. 706. Danæus in his booke of Antichrist cap. 38. writeth: *That there were very few Protestants and those dwelling in wildernesses, and also vnknowne to others.* Iunius in his 4. booke of the Church cap. 5. speaketh thus of Protestants before Luther: *They professed their sayth amongst themselues, but not before dogges & wild beasts who would runne vpon them.* D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quæst. 2. cap. 2. pag. 458. *We say it* (the Protestant Church) *manifest to all? Not but to those only who had eyes.* And pag. 468: *There was no true Church on earth, which appeared to all.* And quæst. 6. cap. 2. pag. 359: *We care not for their ouerfling solitude vnto vs. For we are not ashamed to haue recalled our Church out of this kind of solitude.* D. Fulke to the Cauillations of Stapleton: *The whole forme of the Church was for some ages vnknowne to the vngratefull world.* And in his booke of succession pag. 118: *They confessed Christ, but not alwayes before heretiks; but before themselues and the Church.* And in his notes vpon the 11. cap. of the Acts: *If by visible you vnderstand that which is seene and knowne to the whole world; it is not true, that the Church was alwayes visible.* D. Morton in the 1. part of his Apology booke 1. cap. 16. sayth: *They professed secretly not publikely.* D. White in his way to the Church pag. 95: *That they professed among them-*

Inuisible to Papists.

vnknown to others.

Knowne only to Protestats

themselues. Osiander in his Manuel pag. 59: *In the visible Church of Rome there was the inuisible company of beleeuers hidden to the eye of the world.* Cælius secundus Curio in his booke of the hardnes of the Kingdome of God, pag. 312: *It came to passe that for many yeares the Church lay hid; and that the Citizens of this Kingdome could scarce, or not at all be discerned from others.* And the Scots in their generall confession: *VVe say, that this is the only true Christian fayth, which is now reuealed to the world.* Thus they acknowledg that before Luthers tym Protestants were vnknown to the Pope and his officers, to their enemies, to the world, to all others besides themselues, could not be discerned from others, lurcked in desertes, in darknesses, like sparkles vnder much ashes, professed not their fayth before the world, or their aduersaries, but at most before themselues, and were known only to those that had eyes, that is, to themselues.

3. The same also they meane, when they teach that the church of God may be inuisible to the world, and all that are out of it. Iunius in his 2. book of the church cap. 13: *VVe conclude that the outward forme and visible shape of the Church, may so in common vanish, that it cannot be pointed at, or perceiued of the world.* And againe: *The Church is oftentymes couered and inuisible to the world.* And cap. 16: *The visible fashion of the Church may be hid and faile from the vngratefull world.* And in his Theologicall Theses cap. 43: *Sometymes the church appeareth to the faithfull alone; sometymes it is knowne to some godly persons, not to euery one.* Besnage in his booke of the state of the visible and inuisible Church, cap. 4: *The Church is not alwayes knowne to the world.* Sonis in his answere to Spondé cap. 2. pag. 32: *God sometymes taketh away the face of the Church from men.* Lubbertus in his 3. booke of the Church cap. 4: *VVe affirme that the Church may be driuen*

They teach that the church may be inuisible to the world.

Often inuisible to the world.

driuen to those straights, that it may lye hid from the world and persecutors. And cap. 6: *We deny that the is alwayes visible to the world;* which he repeateth againe cap. 7. Riuet in his Epitome of Controuersies treatise 1. sect. 37: *It happeneth sometymes that the Church hath byn inuisible, or rather hidden sometymes from the eyes of persecutors, sometymes from the eyes of the faythfull themselues, to wit of some and the most of them.* D. Whitaker Controuers. 2. quest. 3. cap. 3. pag. 474: *We say, that the Church may be conserued in so few, that it appeare not to the world.* And quæst. 5. cap. 6. pag. 508: *It is most false, that the Church shall alwayes be knowne, and manifest to the world.* D. Fulke to Stapletons Cauillat. *Bullinger, Alphonse, Chytreus, Marlorate and all the rest, do acknowledge that the Church by the defence of Christ shalbe protected in the desert, that is in places remote from the sight and accesse of the wicked.* Againe: *The Church is not alwayes apparent to the multitude of the wicked.* And in his booke of Succession pag. 19: *It is not doubted, whether the Ecclesiasticall succession of persons and places ought sometymes to be visible to the world, but whether at all tymes.* And pag. 21: *Sometyme the Church is vnknowne to the world.* Pag. 42: *God would sometymes prouide for the Church in this sort, in striking her enemies with blindnes, that they could not find her.* And pag. 129. *The externall policy of the Church is vnknowne to the world, that is, to the enemies of the Church.* And pag. 366: *I affirme that the Church is sometymes vnknowne to the world.* D. White in his way to the Church pag. 86: *The question is only of the outward state of the Church, whether it be alway visible to the world or not, that in euery age those congregations may be discerned and pointed to, which are the true Church. For we say not.* Pag. 87: *This number may be very small, and their profession so secret amongst themselues, that the world, and such as lone not the truth shall not see them, they remayning so hidden, as if they were not at all.* And pag. 97. *The Church*

may

may be bid or become inuisible sometyme, so that the world cannot see it. D. Morton in the 1. part of his Apology, lib. 1. cap. 16: Protestants say the Church is not always known to all the faythfull, nay to her enemies. And this he termeth the proper defence of Protestants. And cap. 13: When Protestants say, the Church is sometymes eclipsed like the moone, they meane that she is enough sometymes to be seene, that is not seene but of those, which are in her, but not openly knowne by her visibility, vtter, or visible succession, or to all the faythfull. D. Willet in his Synopsis Contr. 2 quest. 1. pag. 67: A number of faythfull people hath byn alwayes in the world, but not alwayes visible to the world. Againe: If by visible they vnderstand that which is actually visible, we say it is not so alwayes visible to the world. Thus we see that for to maintaine the inuisibility of their Church, they teach that the visible forme of the Church of God may vanish, may lye hid, may faile from the world, is often taken away from men by God, is vnknowne to the world. That the Church sometymes is vnknowne or appeares not visible to the world, sometyme knowne only to the faythfull, & yet not to all them neither, but to some and the fewer of them, and that neither, by any visible rites, nor by visible succession, and that this kind of doctrine they terme the proper defence of Protestants, to wit, for to defend the inuisibility of their Church before Luther. Which kind of defence hath neither truth nor probability, and though it had, yet would it not suffice to defend the inuisibility of their Church before Luthers tyme, when it was inuisible not only to the world, to enemies, to strangers, to some or most of the faythfull; but to all and every one, as shall manifestly appeare hereafter. Protest ats proper defence.

4. If any say, that it is no meruayle if Protestants teach that their Church was inuisible to the

world, because the true Church cannot be seene but by fayth: I answeare, first that this supposeth their Church to be the true Church, which ought not to be supposed, but proued. Secondly that they teach, that the Church may be vnknowne, not only to the world, but also to some or most of the faythfull. Lastly that the true Church may be knowne two wayes, one way to be the true Church of God, an other to be knowne distinctly from all other Churches; as Christ was knowne to be the Messias only by his disciples, but yet he was knowne distinctly from all other men by the Iewes. And the scripture is knowne to be the word of God only by Christians, but is knowne distinctly from other writings by Infidels. And in Christs tyme his company was known to be the true Church of God, only by the faythfull, but knowne distinctly from all other companies or Churches euen by Infidels. And the same we say of his Church from his tyme vnto our dayes, that it is and euer was knowne to be the true Church of God, only of the faythfull, but known and seene distinctly from all other Churches euen by the world & Infidels. And of his kind of knowledge and visibility, wherewith the true Church is knowne and visible not only to the faythfull, but euen to Infidels, and of the opposite ignorance or inuisibility we speake in this matter, and Protestants also, as appeareth by their testimonies already rehearsed, & shall yet more by those which we shall repeat hereafter.

The true Church discerned from all other Churches euen by Infidels.

That they say their Church was simply inuisible.

5. Further more therefore Protestants do not only teach that their Church may and hath byn inuisible respectiuely; that is, to this or that kind of men, (as we haue already heard,) but also they graunt, that it may be simply and absolutely inuisible.

sible. Luther vpon the 90. psalm. tom. 3. fol. 493: *The Church was and abode in Popery, but truly so hidden, as to one that would iudge by the appearance, she seemed to be no where at all.* And vpon the psalm. 22. fol. 344: *The Church is brought into the dust of death, so that no where there appeareth any shew or trace of her.* And vpon the first chap. of Micheas tom. 4. fol. 434: *In the former ages there was no true forme of religion extant.* The Magdeburgians in the preface of their 10. Century: *It is very hard to find, where & which the Church was in this age.* Likewise in the Preface of the 11. Century: *Euery where was darknes, neither durst the Church muster any thing.* Gerlachius in his 22. disput. of the Church pag. 927. writeth, that before Luther: *The true Church withdrew it selfe from the eyes & sight of men, into lurking holes, and hid her selfe in darknesse.* Zuinglius in his supplication to the Bishop of Constance, tom. 1. fol. 120: *The heauenly doctrine lay a long tyme hid.* Hospinian in the epistle dedicatory of the first part of his History: *From the yeare 1200. vntill the yeare 1515. the Church lay miserably ouerwhelmed, as it were, with a most deep and most strong deluge.* Caluin in the Preface of his Institutions: *God permitted that in former ages there should be no face of the true Church extant.* And addeth of his owne doctrine: *It lay a long tyme vnknowne and buryed.* Againe: *For some ages all things were drowned in deep darknes.* And vpon the 23. chapter of the Acts vers. 6. he sayth: *The Church was hidden from the eyes of men.* And in his Preface vpon Isaias: *Touching the outward shew of the church, nothing for many ages appeared, but desolate and confused most on all sides.* Beza in his booke of the notes of the church pag. 99: *The Church lurked in the wildernes.* Pareus in his 4. booke of grace and freewill cap. 6: *In Constantines tyme the church began to waxe sick to death, notwithstanding the Catholike Church remayned. But where? In the desert, as in the*

Seemed to be no where.

No trace of church appeared.

No forme extant.

No face of church extant.

world withdrawne from the eyes of men. Sadeel in his treatise of the vocation of Ministers pag. 733: After the Church had a long tyme lurked, the Lord called her at this tyme into light. Voyen in his Preface of Catalog. Doct. The true visible Church could not be discerned: no tract of Gods grace appeared in his Church. The Apology of the English Church part. 4. cap. 4. diuis. 2. sayth, that 40. yeares agoe truth first began to spring, vnknowne at that tyme and vnheard of. D. Humfrey vnto the 3. reason of F. Campian pag. 286: VVhy the picture of the Church in these later tymes cannot be seene of our aduersaries, or drawne of vs &c. And pag. 288: If the only names of our Fathers were extant, who either by teaching, or monishing, or writing, did help the Church of Christ, we should see another ranck and progresse of the Church, another succession of Bishops, another picture of Protestants. And pag. 291: And yet they will obiect that our Church was hidden, which they no where suffered alive. D. Whitaker Controu. 2. quest. 3. pag. 479: VVhen they aske of vs, where was our Church in tymes past for so many ages, we answere, that it was in a close wilderneſſe, that is, that it was hidden, lay secret, fled the sight of men. And quest. 5. c. 3. pag. 499: Luther brought the fayth out of darkneſſe, wherein before it lay drowned. And cap. 4. pag. 502: Our Church was then, but you will say, it was not visible. VVhat then? therefore was it not? No. For it lay hidden in the wilderneſſe. M. Perkins in his exposition of the Creed colum. 788: VVe say that many ages past before this our age, that vniuersall defection ouerwhelmed almost all the world, and that our Church was not visible at that tyme. M. Bale, in his 1. Century of the writers of Britanny cap. 4: From Phocas vntill the renewing of the Ghospell, the doctrine of Christ lay so long in lurking holes. M. Downham in his 2. booke of Antichrist cap. 2: The generall defection of the visible Church began to worke in the apostles tyme: M. Powell in his 1. book of Antichrist c. 23: Our religion lay

Could not be discerned.

Vnheard of.

Not so much as their names extant.

Not visible.

Not visible.

lay long tyme vnknowne and buryed. And M. Cox Chancellour of Oxford in King Edward 6. tyme exhorting the vniuersity men to Protestantisme, biddeth them *pluck out truth lying long tyme lurking in Trophonius denne.* Thus clearely and thus many wayes they simply and absolutely graunt, that their Church was inuisible vnknowne and buryed before Luther arose.

vnknown & buried.

6. The same also they intend, when they say, that the Church either was, or can be inuisible. For they would neuer say so, vnlesse they knew that such was the condition of their Church before Luther began. Luther vpon the 90. psalm. tom. 3. fol. 495: *Sometymes the Church was most weake and so dispersed as it appeared no where.* Hutter in his Analysis of the Confession of Ausburg pag. 448: *It is certaine that it may fall out, that the true Church may ly hidden, and her visible forme not at all tymes appeare to the eyes.* Herbrand in his Compend. of diuinity, place of the Church, pag. 502. writeth: *That the faythfull sometymes appeare not to the eyes, euen of the Godly.* Kemnitius in his common places tit. the epistles of the Apostles pag. 78: *Sometymes the true Church (another bastard company preuailing and ouertopping) doth so as it were ly hid, that Elias may say, I am left alone.* Gerlachius, in his 22. dispute of the Church, pag. 946: *No surely, if at some tyme the Church be not seene with corporall eyes, therefore she is not.* Caluin in the Preface of his Institutions: *Sometyme God taketh away the outward knowledge of his Church from the sight of men. Sometyme the Church hath no apparent forme.* And in his treatise of the true Reformation of the Church pag. 232: *The Church sometyme lyeth hid, and flieth the sight of men.* And in his Antidote of the 18. article of the Vniuersity of Paris: *We gather, that the Church is not at all tymes subiect to the eyes of men, as the experience of many ages witnesseth.*

They teach the Church may be simply inuisible.

No where appeare.

Not to the Godly.

Againe: *Elias thought himselfe only left of the Church; falsly indeed, but that is a proofe, that she may lye so hidden.* And in his 4. booke of Institutions cap. 1. §. 3. he affirmeth, that it is not needfull to see or to feele the Church; and that she may passe our knowledge. Beza in his Confession cap. 5. §. 9: *Diuers tymes the Church seemeth to haue perished vtterly.* Iunius in his 3. booke of the church cap. 16: *The Church shall neuer end, but shall lye hidden, according to her visible forme.* Chassanio in his common places loc. 2. of the Church pag. 148: *The Church is not alwayes visible.* Danæus in his 3. booke of the Church cap. 2. *Bellarmine will haue that only to be the Church which is visible which is most false.* Cap. 12: *God oftentymes will haue some visible Church on earth, and oftentymes none. When there is no visible Church, then this precept* (of adioyning himself to the Church) *ceaseth.* And cap. 13: *Bellarmine laboreth to proue the true Church of God on earth to be alwayes visible. That being most false &c.* And cap. 16: *We say, we affirme, we auouch that the Church may so faile on earth, not that there is none at all, but that there is none in respect of vs, that is, of men, that there be none visible to vs on earth.* Againe: S. Paul *inferreth generally that the whole Church may cease to be visible.* And lib. 4. cap. 8: *The true Church may sometymes fault to be visible.* Sonis in his answere to Sponde cap. 21 pag. 33: *God maketh that the Church is not alwayes visible.* Plessy Mornay in his booke of the Church cap. 11: *Oftentymes the good corne is hidden vnder the chaffe without any appearance of the Church.* Polanus in his Antibellarm. Colledge disput. 14: *The visible Church may faile.* Bucanus in his common places loc. 41. sect. 9: *It oftentymes happeneth that there is no company of men extant which publikely and visibly worshippeth God purely.* And sect. 14: *There is alwayes on earth some number which worshippeth Christ sincerely, but this number is not alwayes visible.* Trelcatius in his 1. booke

Oftentyms no visible Church on earth.

The whole Church may haue to be visible.

The visible church may faile.

booke of Theologicall Institutions maketh this title of one Chapter: *That the visible church may fayle against Bellarmine*. Hyperius in his Methode of diuinity lib. 3. pag. 548: *VVhiles Elias wandred here and there, there appeared no face of the Church.* Sadeel in his refutation of the 61. article pag. 531: *They are deceiued who think there is no Catholike Church, vnlesse they measure it with their eyes.* And pag. 535: *The true church may be conserued without any visible state.* And in his repetition of Sophismes pag. 610: *It is plaine, that the Church is not so to be tyed to any outward forme what soeuer, that it ought to be denyed to be a Church, as often as that forme shall not be extant.* And of vocation of Ministers pag. 543: *The Church sometyme wanteth the externall forme.* Againe: *It is cleare that the Church hath sometymes byn without visible and personall succession.* Pag. 550: *Mens wickednes doth sometymes take from vs the visible face of the Church.* And againe: *It is sometymes so darkned, that it appeareth not to our eyes.* Scharpe of Iustification Cont. 5: *The visible Church as such may perish. The members of the visible Church may perish, yea the whole visible Church, as such.* Baltingius vpon the Catechisme, title of the Church, pag. 227: *VVithout doubt in euery age things haue byn so troubled, as like a graine, couered with straw, there appeared no face of the Church.* Vorstius in his Antibellarm. pag 133: *A litle before the calling of Abraham, no where appeared any visible Church.* And pag. 136: *Hereupon it followeth, that the visible church of Christ not only in a great part, but also taken whole in her vttermost extent, may for some tyme faile from the true fayth, and be wholy darkned. The outward church of Christ may perish.* And pag. 424: *Neither did Christ promise, that he would absolutely and perpetually hinder the perishing and corruption of the outward Church.* The Flemmings Confession article 27: *The Church in the eyes of men for sometyme seemeth as extinguished.* And Napper vpon the

Wanteth outward forme.

The whole visible Church may perish.

The whole visible Church may faile.

11. chap. of the Apoc. pag. 486: *They erre, who think that the true Church is always visible.* And vpon 12. cap. pag. 495: *The visible Church wholy imbraced the errors of merits, of indulgences &c.* And Propositi. 20. pag. 41: *The true Church was invisible, and the true knowledge of God so covered with darknesse, that none could visibly enter.* Thus foraine Protestants. Of our coūtrymen D. Whitaker Contr. 2. quest 3. cap. 2. pag. 470: *Sometymes obscurity most of all helpeth the church, For at some tyme she could not be safe, vnlesse she lay hid.* And cap. 3. pag. 474: *We say that sometyme the Church may auoyd the sight of men, & hide it selfe in corners.* Cap. 1. pag. 466: *We confesse, that euer more there is on earth some number of them, who piously worship Christ, & hold the true fayth and religion, but we say that this number is not alwayes visible. Their* (Papists) *opinion is, that there is euer more on earth a visible church. It may fall out that there cannot be found out and knowne any true and certaine visible church.* And cap. 2. cit. pag. 468: *Our aduersary would proue, that there was alwayes in the world some visible church.* And pag. 469: *Hence inferreth* (Denis the Carthusian) *not as our aduersaries do, that the visible church can neuer perish, or that there is euer more in the world some visible church; but that fayth shall neuer perish wholy, but that Christian religion shall still perseuer in some to the end of the world. This* (sayth Whitaker) *is plainly that which we say and defend.* Marke how plainly he professeth, that they do not teach, that the visible Church cannot perish, or that there is alwayes some visible Church on earth, but only that some shall alwayes beleiue the Christian religion. The same doctrine he teacheth pag. 470. 473. 475. 476. and 479. And q. 6. cap. 2. pag. 559. And in his third booke against Duræus sect. 5. 6. 7. 11. M. Perkins in his problem. title of the church: *The ancients do acknowledge, that the church on earth is not alwayes visible.* D. Willet in his Synopsis

Not alwayes visible.

The visible church may perish.

Note.

Cont.

Cont. 2. q. 1. pag. 67: *We say the church is not alwayes actually visible to the world: nay it may sometyme be so hid and secret that the members know not one another.* Againe: *In the dayes of Elias the church was not visible.* And quest. 2. pag. 74: *A visible church we define, to be a congregation of men, amongst whome the word is truly preached, and the Sacraments administred. Such a church hath not alwayes byn, neither can we be assured that it shall alwayes be found vpon the earth. There was a tyme when as the visible church failed vpon earth.* This inuisibility of the Protestant Church, which I haue hitherto proued by their manifold Confessions, I will also proue by sequels out of other their sayings. First therefore D. Morton in his Apology part. 1. book. 1. cap. 31. disliketh not these words of Bellarmine: *Protestants when they say the church cannot faile or perish, meane the inuisibible church.* And many of them in expresse words deny, that the Promises of perpetuity, which in the scripture are made vnto the church, Math. 16. and other where, be made to the visible church. D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 3. cap. 3. pag. 468: *It is most false, that it is the visible church, against which the gates of hell shall not preuaile.* And Danæus Cont. 4. lib. 3. cap. 12. pag. 717: *There* (Math. 16.) *is not meant the visible church.* To whome assenteth D. Willet in his Synopsis cont. 2. quest. 2. M. Powell of Antichrist lib. 1. cap. 10. Bentlin in his Refutation of Sotus, cap. 53. Moulins of the vocation of Ministers lib. 1. c. 4. & in his Bucklar part. 1. pag. 49. And D. Morton lib. cit. cap. 13. addeth that those three places Math. 16. & vlt. and psal. 47. which promise the perpetuity of the Church. *Are euery one of them vnderstood, almost by euery Father, of the only company of the elect*, which the Protestants call the inuisible Church. Besides, they all generally teach, that by the Catholike Church, which they professe to

In Elias tyme not visible.

The visiblechurch failed.

Protestãts say the promises belong not to the visible Church.

Protestãts believe not the visible church.

believe

beleiue in the Creed, they meane not the visible Church, but only the inuisible, Luther in his booke of abrogating Masse, tom 2. fol. 247: *VVho shall shew vs the holy church, seeing it is hidden in spirit, and is only beleiued, according as I beleiue the holy church.* Zuinglius in his explication of the 31. article: *The church, which consisteth of those which are knowne to God alone, in that which we professe in the articles of our creed.* Danæus lib. cit. pag. 713: *The question is of the true church of God whereof it is sayd in the creed: I beleiue the holy church. Bellarmine vvill haue it to be the visible, vve deny it.* The like he sayth pag. 789. 717. 718. and 725. Vorstius in his Antibellarm. pag. 144: *VVe professe not in the creed to beleiue the visible church, but the inuisible.* D. Whitaker lib. 3. against Duræus sect. vlt: *You see vvhat Catholike church vve beleiue, not the visible multitude of Christians, but the holy company of the elect.* The same he sayth Cont. 2. quest. 2. cap. 2. Brentius in Prolegominis pag. 2. and others commonly. Furthermore they say, that the visible Church is not the true Church in the sight of God. For Caluin in his 4. book of Institutions cap. 1. §. 7. and the rest graunt, that both wicked and reprobate Christians may be of the visible Church, but deny that they can be of the true Church in the sight of God. Now surely if the visible Church be neither the true Church in the sight of God, nor she to whome he hath promised perpetuity, nor she which Protestants do beleiue; what reason can they haue to beleiue that the visible Church shall alwayes remayne, or (which is all one) that the Church shall be alwayes visible. Againe, their common doctrine is, that preaching of true doctrine is the note of the visible Church; for so teacheth the Confession of Auspurg cap. 7. the English Confession artic. 19. and all the rest. To which his Maiesty

They say the visible Church is not the true Church before God.

Maiesty in his epist. to Cardinall Peron, D. Whitaker Contr. 1. q 5. c. 17. D. Morton part. 1. Apol. l. 1. c. 6. M. Willet in his Synopsis Cont. 2. quest. 3. pag. 102. Sadeel to Turrians Sophismes loc. 5. Vorstius in Antibellarm. pag. 145. and others do adde, that it is an essentiall note of the visible Church. And it is manifest that they must say so, because they vse to define the visible Church, to be a company, *wherein the pure word of God is preached, & the Sacraments rightly administred.* For so it is defined of the English Confession and of Sadeel lib. cit. of Whitaker quest. 5. cit. cap. 20. of Melâcthon tom. 1. in cap. 15. Matth. and of others generally. But before Luther there was no preaching of Protestantisme, as we shall heare them confesse cap. 7. therefore there was then no visible Protestant Church. Finally, somerymes they say that not only preaching of the word, but that also a lawfull ministery; or, that not only what true preaching soeuer, but also such as is made by a lawfull Minister, of the word, is of the essence and substance of the visible Church. For thus writeth D. Whitaker Cont. 2. q. 5. cap. 19. pag. 556: *Stapleton sayth, that the preaching of the Ghospell by lawfull Ministers is the proper note of the church, and we say no other wise.* And pag. 551. *That he confesseth true preaching by a lawfull Ministery to be a note of the church, is no other thing then that we say and defend.* The like hath Sadeel in the place now cited: and the Switzers Confession cap. 17. putteth lawfull preaching for *the chiefest note of the church*; Caluin 4. Institut. cap. 2. 4. 1. for *a perpetuall note*, & the conclusions defended at Geneua pag. 845. for *an essentiall note thereof.* But before Luther there were no Protestant Ministers at all, as we shall hereafter heare the Protestants confesse. Therefore no visible Protestant Church.

§. By

Summe of the foresayd confessions.

8. By that which hath byn rehearsed, it is manifest, that very many and very famous Protestants haue often and plainly confessed that when Luther came first (as they speake) to the Ghospell, the Protestant Church and religion was not visible, lay hid, lurked, lay in the wildernes, in lurking holes, in darknesse, in Trophonius his denne, was buryed, was vnknowne, vnheard of, appeared to none, cold not be discerned: Her image could not be seene, no shew of, besides a huge spoile did appeare; no face, no fashion, no trace of her was extant, and she was so hid, that he who would iudge according to the outward shew, would think her to be no where: And that this is so manifest, as that the experience of many ages beareth witnes thereof. With what words, I pray you, could they say that their Church was altogeather inuisible, if they haue not sayd it in these?

9. Moreouer it is manifest, that for to maintaine their inuisible Church, they do teach, that the Church may be vnknowne to the godly, & to those who are of it; that it may be not visible, not appeare, not be seene by corporall eyes; that the externall knowledge therof may be taken from men, that it may consist of no apparent forme, be without any visible condition, without visible succession, and destitute of outward forme. That the visible face thereof may be taken from vs, that it may seeme to haue vtterly perished, that the visible Church may perish, the outward Church perish, that it may wholy leaue to be visible, and the whole visible Church perish, and finally that there be no true visible Church in the world.

10. Besides, it is cleare, that they teach, that

not

not only some part of the visible Church, but also (as they speake) the whole and all the visible Church may go with, and that it may fall out that there be now, none at all, no visible Church in the world. Certainly (as S. Austin speaketh) these words need no witty interpreter, but only an honest heart. De grat. & lib. arb. c. 8.

11. Whereby also it is evident, that D. White in the defence of his way cap. 38. and 40. sayd vntruly, that Protestants imagine not the Church to haue byn at any tyme simply invisible. For as we haue heard, they oftentymes professe openly the contrary. Vtterly also D. Whitaker aboucheth Cont. 2. quest. 3. cap. 2. pag. 472. that we slaunder them, when we say they make such a Church, as sometymes can be seene of none. For as hath byn seene, many, and he amongst the rest, haue taught so. But D. Whitaker by the name of a visible Church, vnderstandeth not a company visibly professing their fayth, but one or two, or some few visible men, who keep their fayth secretly in their harts. But this, is not the church to haue byn visible, but the men to haue byn visible. Besides that, it is inough for vs, that the Protestant Religion and manner of worshipping God was before Luthers tyme altogeather invisible, and only secret in the hearts of some few. For thence it will follow, (as shall appeare hereafter) that it is not the religion of God, which can neuer be kept so secret and invisible. Vntruly also sayth Iunius Cont. 4. lib. 3. cap. 16. when he writeth: *This only we say, the visible manner of the Church may be hid, or faile to the very ateful world, not that it can become invisible in it selfe.* For that which is so invisible, as the Protestants haue sayd the Church may be, is in it selfe invisible. Protestats vntrue shifts refuted. Num. 5. 6.

Lastly some do vntruly expound the foresayd words

of

of Protestants, as if they had only sayd, that their Church had byn inuisible in some sort, not simply and absolutely; because their words were most absolute: and it is sophisticall to expound so many absolute speeches, only in some sort: Besides, hereafter we shall see, that sometymes they confesse, that their church was so inuisible, as it implyed contradiction to haue it seene, and those who limitate the former speaches, agree not togeather in their expositions; For D. Whitaker loc. cit. sayth they only meane, that the Church is not alwayes to be seene glorious and of euery one. D. White lib. cit. cap. 37. that they meane that the Church is not alwayes to be seene a part and free from all errour. D. Morton Apol. part. 1. lib. 1. cap. 13. that they only meant, that the church is not alwayes to be seene publikely of all men by her visible rites, and visible succession: which shift he calleth the *Bulwarck of Protestants*. But this Bulwarck is built of him without all foundation, and is manifestly ouerthrowne by the former Confessions. D. Feild sayth they meane not, that the Church is wholy inuisible, at any tyme; but that it is not alwayes to be esteemed by outward appearance. But what more manifest; then that they teach that the Church may be wholy inuisible, as appeareth by their words already rehearsed, and shall yet more appeare by and by?

The Protestit Church impossible to haue byn seene.

12. For they not only confesse that their Church was altogeather inuisible before Luther arose, but also they affirme, that it is a most vniust and impudent demaund, to request them to shew it before that tyme. Hutter in his Analysis of the Confession of Ausburg pag. 448: *It is an impudent demaund of the Romanists, to request to haue shewed vnto them such a church*

Impudent demaund.

in

in former dayes, which touching the publike ministery and visible forme, agreed in all things with Luther. For we haue demonstrated that the true Church then lay hid. Dr. Fulke in his booke of Succession pag. 19: *But you bid me bring forth those elect (Protestants) which lay hid through all the world. Good God how vniust a thing do you demaund, that I should bring forth them, whome I say lay hid?* And Sadeel to the Repetition of Turrians Sophismes pag. 706: *But I promised not as you say, that I would answeare to this your question, where those inuisible remnants lay hid? as if I had not sufficiently answeared, when I sayd that they lay hid by the vnsearcheable counsaile of God.* And in his answere to Theses Posnan. cap. 8. He will haue them to haue layne so closely, that it cannot be knowne what they did. And in his booke of Vocation of Ministers pag. 551: *At last came that generall Apostasy, which the Apostle foretold. For then the outward light of the Church being quite extinct, there remayned the only shadow and name of the visible Church.* The same also intimateth Plessy Mornay in the Preface of his Mystery of iniquity, when he sayth: *We are not bound to shew the Church, it sufficeth that God knew his owne.* And Iohn Regius in his Apology pag. 176: *You deny that Luther found a company of his sect. I say there was an ecclesiasticall company of true religion, and which agreed with Luther in all points. But when the Iesuits vrge to shew a follower of religion, they would that Luther shew, that which implieth, and proue the inuisible to be visible.* Napper vpon 12. cap. Apocal. pag. 294: *From the yeare 316. God withdrew his visible Church from the open assemblies of men, to the hearts of particuler men, and from that tyme the Church lay hid and was inuisible.* The same he sayth pag. 288: But if so it be an impudent and vniust demeand to haue their Church shewed before Luther, if it were withdrawne from open assemblies to the hearts of some, if her outward

Vniust.

Only shadow and name of visible Church.

Implied to be visible.

light

light were quite extinct, and the only shadow and name of the visible Church remayned, and lastly if it implyed contradiction that she should be shewed, it is most euident, that she was altogether inuisible. The same also they intimate, when they say, that the Church either hath byn at any tyme, or may be thus inuisible. Luther vpon the 90. psalme tom. 3. fol. 495: *The Church was then* (in Elias tyme) *but so hidden, as it was no where, but in the sight of God.* Hyperius in his Methode of diuinity, lib. 3. pag. 349: *VV as not the true Church at that tyme* (of Elias) *altogether inuisible to men, and knowne to God alone?* The Switzers Confession cap. 17: *The Church hidden from our eyes, and knowne to God only, doth often fly the iudgement of men.* Besnage in his booke of the state of the visible and inuisible church, cap. 4: *The Church is oftsones knowne to God alone.* Sonis in his answere to Sponde cap. 2. pag. 32: *VV e say the state of the Church is such, as is sometymes known to God alone.* And D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 3. cap. 3 pag. 478: *VV e say that the externall state of the Church doth cease, and that the faythfull and godly may be so scattered, that they worship God only in heart and mind.* But who seeth not, that it implieth manifest contradiction, that a Church which is no where but in the sight God, which is knowne to God alone, which flyeth mans iudgement, and which worshippeth God only in heart and mind, should be visible or seene of man?

Church no where but in the sight of God.

Knowne to God alone.

Worship God in heart only.

13. If any aske them, how many ages their Church was thus inuisible? Luther vpon the 1. cap. to the Galat. tom. 5. fol. 214. sayth that she lay hid aboue 300. yeares. To whome commeth neere Dinæus in his 3. booke de Romano Pontif. cap. 8. saying, the Church *was in banishment* 350. *yeares*. But Luther better thinking on the matter, in his booke of the

How long the Protestats Church was inuisible.

Popery

Popery tom. 1. maketh her to haue lurked 600. years. And with him agreeth Hospinian in his epistle dedicatory of the 1. part of his History. Melanchthon in his oration for Luther tom. 2. will haue this lurking to haue byn 400. yeares. But Caluin his booke of Scandals, Perkins and Bale in the places before cited, will haue it to haue continued 900. years. Parcus aboue cited will haue it to haue begon in Constantines tyme; and Napper from the yeare of our Lord 316. With whome consenteth Brocard vpon the 11. Chap. Apocal. pag. 110. Fuccius in his Cronology fetcheth the beginning of this lurking a litle higher, from the yeare 261. and finally Curio of the largenesse of Gods Kingdome pag. 33: *Almost from the Apostles ages euen to our tym.* Which they also intimate, who say that Popery began in the Apostles tyme. *O Christ most patient Lord* (that I may cry out with Tertullian) *who so many years* (yea so many ages) *diddest suffer thy doctrine to be turned vpside downe till* Luther *came to helpe thee.*

14. Of all things which haue byn related in this Chapter, it is most cleare, that Luther was at least author of the Protestants visible Church, and if not the first which founded it, yet the first which after it was fallen & in substance perished, did rayse and restore it againe. For when Luther began first to preach, there was no visible Protestant Church at all, and by his preaching there became such a visible Church. Therefore vndoubtedly he was the author thereof. And if any Protestant against so many and so open Confessions of his Fathers and brethren, will say that there was a visible Protestant Church before Luther, he shall first gainesay so many witnesses without all exception in this matter, who hauing searched all corners, and enquired of all men,

Luther Author of the visible Protestant Church.

haue neuertheleſſe confeſſed, that at that tyme no ſuch viſible Church appeared. Beſides, he ſhall ſay that, without all either diuine or humane teſtimony; which to do of tymes before his age, is to play the Prophet, or rather the mad man. For it is not the part of a man in his witter, to affirme without all kind of teſtimony, eſpecially ſuch a thing and ſo manifeſtly falſe, as that ſo many, and ſuch kind of men, as had moſt need to affirme it, were neuertheleſſe forced to deny it. That it wanteth all ſufficient humane teſtimony is euident, becauſe neither the foreſayd Proteſtants, nor any yet to this day, could bring forth any ſufficient witneſſe, who would depoſe that he had ſeene ſuch a Church before Luthers reuolt. That alſo it is deſtitute of diuine teſtimony, is manifeſt by what hath byn before rehearſed. For Proteſtants (as we haue heard) teach, that the promiſes of perpetuity, which in the ſcripture are made to the church, are made only to the inuiſible church, that is to a ſociety of men in election and Iuſtification, out of which Church they exclude the reprobate and wicked; and not to the viſible Church, that is, to the ſociety in Profeſſion of true doctrine and lawfull vſe of Sacraments. And in truth they moſt needs ſay ſo, ſith they commonly teach, that the inuiſible Church, whereof the elect and iuſt alone are members, is the true Church before God: and that the viſible Church, whereof the wicked & reprobate may be members, is but a Church in ſight of men, that is a ſhadow and outward ſhew of the Church. And it is cleare, that God promiſed perpetuity to that Church only, which in his ſight is the true Church; and not to her which is no Church, but only in ſight of men. When as I ſay they teach that

Sup. num. 7.

that God promised perpetuity and continuance only to the inuisible Church, out of his promises they cannot inferre, that the visible Church hath or shall euer continue. *Of whome therefore* (that I may vse S. Augustins words) *hast thou heard this? whence diddest thou learne it? where hast thou read it for to beleeue it? whereupon hast thou presumed for to affirme it, where there is neither any authority nor reason?* If Protestants cry out, that it is most absurd, to say in Elias his tyme there was any Church visible amongst the Gentils beside the Synagogue, which now after so many thousands of years we cannot name; how much more absurd ought they think it, to say that before Luther arose, there was a visible Protestant Church, which yet none neither of that Church, nor out of it, neither at this tyme, nor at that, could euer name?

Lib. 2. cont. Maxim. c. 3. l. 3. c. 276

Whitak. cont. 2. q. 3. c. 3.

15. It being thus manifest, that Luther was the Author of the visible Protestant Church, it followeth likewise that he was the author of all and Euery Protestant Church. For (as shall be shewed hereafter) there can be no such inuisible Church as Protestants meane, that is, such as beleueth and worshippeth God only in hart and mind, and no way professeth outwardly her fayth and religion. Yet before we come to that, we will first refute those, who when they consider how absurd a thing it is to affirme such an inuisible Church, especially for so many ages, they begin to shufle and either send vs to others, or themselues name vs such, as only in part or in some sort held Protestantisme, but imbraced not all the substantiall points thereof, and therefore were but halfe Protestants. For to vs it sufficeth, that we shew Luther to haue byn the Author and beginner of whole and true Protestants, such as held

all points that are necessary to the making of an absolue Protestant.

Those confuted who say there were some visible Protestants when Luther arose.

CHAP. V.

What a mã Illyricus was.

1. SOME Protestants, when we aske of them who were the visible Protestants before Luther began, do not themselues name any, but send vs to Illyricus or M. Fox. So playeth D. Whitaker lib. 3. against Duræus sect. 12. and lib. 7. sect. 1 D. Fulke of Succession pag. 324. Schusselburg in 8. tom. of his Catalogue of Heretiks pag. 365. Vorstius in his Antibellarm. pag. 159. Lubbert lib. 5. of the Church c. 2. and others: These men do manifestly shew that thẽselues know not of any such visible Protestants. For they would neuer lay the burden of answering this question vpon others, if they could haue answered it themselues. And besides, they declare that they know no author worthy of credit, to whome they might send vs, for the answere of this so important demaund, else they would neuer haue referred vs to Illyricus or M. Fox. For Illyricus in the iudgement of most Protestants both Lutherans and Sacramentaries, *was a vagabond, a bell hound, an heretike, a Manichee, deceitfull, a lyar, an impostor, a falsifier, a Caviller, a slaunderer, a singular inuenter of slaunders, a syrophant in his own iudgement, impudently blasphemous, a broacher of doctrine which bringeth in Epicurisme and mortality of the soule, and ouerthroweth all religion; and who had nothing to impugne true withall,*

Colloq. Aldeburg Hosp. part 2. fol. 104. Bezæ pist. 33. in Mat. 26 ver. 15. in 4. Ephe. Scultet. Præfat. in tom. 2. Pareus lib. 5. de Amiss. grat. cap. 1 Melanchth. tom. 2. Hesk. in Antid. Schusselb. Præf. to. 2. Kemnit. loc. p. 262.

withall, besides an audacious ignorance, and a very dissolute spirit. This and much more write the Protestants themselues of Illyricus; wherefore to send vs to such a man, is plainly to confesse that they know no man of credit to whome they may referre vs. And of the like stuffe is Fox, a most impudent patcher of lyes, who in his false Martyrologe propoſeth theeues, traytors, ſorcerers, murderers of themſelues, Anabaptiſts, Papiſts, profeſſed enemies, and ſome then aliue, for Proteſtant Martyrs, as Allen Cope ſheweth in the ſixt book of his dialogues. Beſide, thoſe whom Illyricus nameth before Luther, himſelfe dares not cal Proteſtants, but *VVitneſſes of truth*; becauſe forſooth they diſliked ſome doctrine or fact of the Pope. And ſuch witneſſes alſo they are, as ſome of them be Popes themſelues, as (a) Pius 2. ſome famous Papiſts, as (b) Peter Lumbard, and Gratian, whome himſelfe calleth the (c) *Pillars of the Religion of the Roman Antichriſt*, and ſayth they *renewed Popery euen from the foundation*; ſome profeſſed aduerſaries of Proteſtãts, as (d) Clichtouæus; ſome of the holy Fathers, who (as before was ſeene) condemned the very ſoule and ſumme of Proteſtancy; ſome thoſe, who only diſliked the corrupt manners of ſome Popes, as (e) Richard Hampell; ſome Atheiſts, as (f) Machiauell; ſome who any-way (g) gainſayd either the doctrine or deed of any Pope. Surely for Illyricus to bring ſuch witneſſes, after he had ſearched in all corners, and raked in all chanels, doth manifeſtly bewray, that there can no true Proteſtants be found before Luthers tyme. For Illyricus, though neuer ſo impudent, would haue byn aſhamed to haue bragged of ſuch ſilly witneſſes, if he could haue found any true Proteſtants whatſoeuer. Beſides, ſuch fellowes, may be only ſayd to haue byn

(a) *Lib.* 19.
(b) *Lib.* 15.
(c) *Lib.* 15. & 16.
(d) *Lib.* 19.
(e) *Centur.* 6. *cap.* 1.
(f) *Lib.* 6.
(g) *Præf. Catal.*

Protestants, and can no way be proued to haue byn simply and absolutely Protestants, such as we speake of. And we care not whom any one may say to haue byn Protestants (for as Luther sayth, *what is more easy then to say any thing?*) but whome he can proue & conuince to haue byn such; without which his saying is but voluntary and ridiculous, and the beliefe therof rash and vnreasonable.

Tom. 2. fol. 437.

3. And as for those, which M. Fox produceth for Protestants before Luther, they liued in the yeare of our Lord 1521. as himselfe writeth pag. 749. in the edition of 1596. that is, in the 4. yeare of Luthers new preaching, and we aske for Protestants before Luther. Besides they all abiured their sayth, as himselfe confesseth pag. 750. and soone after dyed for sorrow, or lingered away with shame; and we aske for Protesters not Abiurers. Moreouer no one of them is found to haue held that cheife and fundamentall article of Protestancy of Iustification by speciall faith, albeit, as Fox writeth pag. 550: There was such diligent inquisition made as that no article could be so secretly taught amongst them but it was discouered. Wherefore these wretched Abiurers were no Protestats, but some reliques of the Wiclifists or Lollards, whereof we will intreat anone.

The waldenses were no Protestats

3. Others say, that the Waldenses were the visible Protestants before Luthers rising, but there is no apparent reason to say, that they were true & absolute Protestants, to wit, such as held all the whole substance necessary to a Protestant. For first, there is no writer before Luthers tyme who sayth that they believed to be iustified by only sayth. Neither can any such thing be gathered, either out of their own opinions, or out of the writings of Catholiques

against them at those tymes. And Illyricus in his Catalogue of witnesses printed at Geneua 1597. lib. 15. pag. 544. writeth their opinions out of an ancient Catholique writer, and pag. 559. out of Aeneas Siluius, and pag. 539. relateth their Confession out of Sleidan, and himselfe pag. 536. reckoneth 13. of their articles, of which he hath these words: *These are the articles of the VValdenses, albeit others part them into more branches, and make them more.* But in none of them is there any trace of only iustifying fayth. The same I say of their Confession which the sayd Illyricus hath in his Catalogue printed at Geneua 1526. yea there col. 1832. he sayth, that Husse and Hierome of Prage did add vnto the doctrine of the Waldenses the article of free iustification by only fayth, as (sayth he) Syluius intimateth: wherein albeit he belye both Husse and Hierome & also Syluius, because neither they knew of any such iustification, (as shall straight appeare) neither Syluius intimateth any such matter; yet it clearly bewrayeth, that the waldenses beleiued not iustification by only fayth. Moreouer Luther (as we shall now rehearse) confesseth that the Waldenses knew nothing of his imputatiue iustice by only fayth: How then can they be sayd to haue byn true and absolute Protestants, who wanted the very soul, summe, and definition of a Protestant? Secondly they not only beleiued not iustification by only fayth, but beleiued the contrary; that is, to be iustifyed by good works. For thus sayth Luther of them in his table-talkes chap. of Suermers: *The VValdenses are holy workmen and beleiue not that fayth without works doth iustify, and know nothing at all of imputatiue iustice.* And Bennet Morgenstern in his treatise of the church p. 214. speaketh thus vnto them: *We confirme the doctrine* Num. 7. Coccius tom. 1. lib. 8.

of Antichrist, touching good works, iustification, &c. And themselues in their Apology printed at Hanow together with the history of Bohemia pag. 256. plainly shew, that they beleeue a man to be iustified by fayth, charity, hope, penance, and works of mercy, and do say: *That deuout prayer doth purge, and pennance cleanse a man.*

4. Thirdly, the Waldenses are condemned of Protestants, both Lutherans and Sacramentaries. Melanchthon in his Counsailes part. 2. pag. 152. writeth: *I reioyce that you agree with vs in the summe of doctrine. I know the VValdenses are vnlike.* And in Carions Chronicle printed at Paris 1557. he sayth that they *sowed errors, denyed all oathes, and all forme of prayer, besides the Lords prayer.* Morgenstern in his fornamed booke pag. 79. giueth this verdict of them: *They haue proudly neglected the light of doctrine which is kindled from heauen in this age; & haue with tooth and nayle by writing among their own men secretly defended those most grosse errors, which in the yeer 1523. were discouered by Luther.* Besides Selnecer (as he reporteth) affirmed, that they *had grosse errors, and such as were not to be borne withall.* Leonicus Antisturmius also in Danæus in his answere to his Sonde pag. 1516. pronounceth them to be impious; and Schusselburg in his 3. tome of the Catalogue of heretiks pag 188. reckeneth them as heretiks. Camerarius in his booke of the Church in Bohemia, Poland, &c. pag. 273. writeth thus: *We can say that the VValdenses were neuer one with our Churches, nor our men would euer ioyne themselues to them.* Whereof he giueth these two reasons: because the Waldenses would not haue extant any publike declaration of their fayth; and for peace sake did vse the Popish masse. *For these two causes* (sayth he) *our men did not ioyne themselues to them, neither did they think that they could*

See Refut. Orthod. Consensus pag. 418.

could so do, with good conscience. Calvin also epist. 278. thus writeth to the Waldenses themselues: *VVe abide in one opinion, that the forme of your Confession cannot be absolutely admitted without danger.* And M. Iewell also in defence of the Apology part. pag. 48. sayth plainly of the Albigenses: *They are none of ours.* D. Humfrey to the third Reason of F. Campian pag. 371: *They are not wholy ours.* And Osiander in his 13. Century lib. 1. cap. 4. Pantaleon in his Chronicle pag. 98. & Melanchon in the foresayd Chronicle of Carion, reckon them amongst heretiks: But the Albigenses were all one for religion with the Waldenses, as D. Fulke sayth in these words, lib. de Succes. pag. 332: *That epistle of the Arch-bishops, doth proue that the Albigenses & VValdenses were all one.* The same also confesseth Illyricus in his Catalogue in 4. to. pag. 536. Where also pag. 561. he speaketh in this sort: *The VValdenses or Albigenses.* Yea the Waldenses themselues, in the Bohemian Confession (if it be theirs) do insinuate that they are condemned of the Sacramentaries, whereas they say in the 13. article, that they, who deny the supper of the Lord to be the true flesh and bloud of Christ, do call them Idolaters, Antichrist, and men branded with the marke of the beast. Besides Illyricus in his forecited catalogue writeth, that the Thaborites, who indeed (sayth he) followed the opinions of the Waldenses, were grieuously vexed and persecuted of Rokesana and other Hussites. Wherefore, sith Protestants commonly challenge the Hussites for their brethren, they ought not to claime also the Waldenses, whose doctrine the Hussites did persecute. Certainly the Confession of Bohemia (which is sayd to be theirs) doth plainly distinguish them from Protestants, especially from Sacramentaries. For art. 2.

they

they say: *We must keep the commandements in hart & deed.* Art. 5. that those which repent must confesse their sinnes to a Priest, and aske absolution of him. Art. 9. that Priests ought to be single. Art. 11. that Sacraments are necessary to saluation. And art. 13. that the Eucharist is the true body of Christ, as (say they) Christ plainly sayth: This is my body; of which words we ought to beleeue the plaine sense, not declining to the right or left. Whereupon it is no mervayle, that Caluin in his 249. epistle denieth it to be lawfull for a Christian man, to imbrace the Waldenses Confession, in these words: *Consider you whether it be lawfull for a Christian man to imbrace the forme of the Confession* (of the Waldenses) *who without any distinction bind vp all in one bundell of damnation, who precisely confesse not, the bread to be presently the body of Christ. Surely we think not.*

5. Fourthly I proue the same, because the Waldenses hold many errors, which the Protestants condemne. Illyricus in his foresayd Catalogue pag. 545. relateth out of an ancient writer about 300. years ago: that they taught, that a Priest being in mortall sinne cold not consecrate the Eucharist; that euery oath is a mortall sinne; that they disallowed matrimony. And likwise out of Aeneas Syluius, that they sayd it was lawfull for euery one to preach; & that he who was guilty of mortall sinne, was not not capable of any secular or ecclesiasticall dignity. Neither auayleth it any thing, that now in the Cōfession of Bohemia (which is sayd to be the Waldenses Confession) there is found the article of iustification by only fayth, because that Confession was presented in the yeare 1525. as the very title thereof declareth, & in the Preface mention is made of Charles 5. Emperour,

5. Emperour, which was after Luther had preached some years. As also because Hospinian part. 2. Histor. fol. 11. sayth, that the Waldenses Confession was renewed or rather corrupted by the Sacramentaries, as the Waldenses themselues say in the Preface of their Confession printed anno 1538. as witnesseth Schusselburg, lib. 2. Theol. Caluin. art. 6. fol. 55. Moreouer Illyricus in his Catalogue in fol. col. 1502. writeth, that after *Luther was knowne, the VValdenses did greedily purchase greater knowledge*. Morgenstern in his foresayd booke pag. 79. sayth, that *they borrow the best part of their doctrine from the Lutherans*. And D. Fulke in his booke of Succession pag. 360. that *they learnt of those of Basle, to amend certaine errors, which they had receiued from their ancestors*. Why then shall we not think, they receiued the doctrine of iustification by only fayth from Luther especially sith (as I befor sayd) there is no mention of it amongst them in former tymes? Againe Iurgeuicius in the 2. chap. of his warre of the 5. ghospell, affirmeth that the Authors of the Bohemian Confession do professe in the beginning thereof, that they would neuer conioyne themselues to the Waldenses; and therefore the Bohemian Confession is not the Waldenses Confession. Nor albeit therein be mention of iustification by only fayth, can it be inferred, that therefore the Waldenses did believe it. Finally (as I haue often sayd and it must be alwayes inculcated) I regard not, whome any one sayth to haue byn Protestants, but whom he proueth to haue byn such. Neither whome he can proue to haue byn Protestants in part and in some sort; but whome he can proue to haue byn absolutely and wholy Protestants, at least for the substance of Protestancy. Neither will it anaile any whit, to complaine, that we

Sacramentaries haue corrupted the Waldenses Cõfessiõ.

haue

haue burnt the writings of the Waldenses, by which they might proue that they were true Protestants. For if they haue not wherwithall to proue they were true Protestants, they in vaine do feigne it. Besides, we asked of Luther & his followers to produce one man, Waldensian or other, who had byn a true Protestant, before Luthers preaching; for which end there was no need of writings, but of liuing men.

Wiclif was no true Protestant.

6. In like sort I proue that Wiclisse and his followers were not true and absolute Protestants. First because the Wiclifists are by name condemned togeather with other heretiks of Protestants in their Apology of the Confession of Ausburg, chap. of the Church in these words: *We haue plainly inough sayd in our Confession, that we disalow the Donatists and Wiclifists.* Secondly because neither in Wiclifs booke, nor of any of his schollers, is there any signe of sole iustifying fayth; neither did euer any Catholike writer contend with them thereabout. Thirdly, because as Melanchon writeth in his epistle to Myconius in his 1. tom. printed at Basle pag. 416: *Wiclif neither vnderstood, nor held the iustice of fayth.* Yea Husse his principall follower, (as we shall anon rehearse) beleiued that works did iustify. And Wiclif himselfe in Thomas Walden. tom 3. tit. 1. cap. 7. bid euery one hope in the proper iustice of his life, and men to trust in their merits: which thing alone doth separate him farre inough from the Protestants campe. Fourthly, because the Wiclifists are reckoned amongst Heretiks of many Protestants, as of Schusselburg tom. 3. Catal. pag. 190. of Kemnice in fundamentis Cœnæ pag. 114. of Pantaleon in his Chronicle, and of Matthias Hoe disput. 27. they are termed *most monstrous monsters.* And D. Cay in his 2. booke of the antiquity of Cambridge,

bridge, obiecteth Wicliffe to the Oxford men, as a staine of their vniuersity. Fifthly wiclif taught diuers things, which Protestants dislike. And to omit these things which Catholikes obiect vnto him, Rokelana Prince of the Hussites, in his dispute with Catholiks before the King of Bohemia, hath these words: *These are the articles of VViclif: That tithes are meere almes: That the Clergy ought to haue no ciuill gouernment: If a King be in mortall sinne, that he is no more a King:* Which last article Osiander in his 15. Century repeateth thus: *There is no temporall Lord, no Prelate, no Bishop, while he is in mortall sinne.* And Melanchon in his foresayd epistle: *VViclif doth plainly, sophistically and seditiously wrangle vpon ciuill dominion.* And in his dispute of the right of Magistrats: *VViclif is mad, who thinketh the wicked to haue no Dominion.* And in his Commentaries vpon Aristotles Politiques: *VViclif would haue those, who haue not the holy ghost, to loose their Dominion.* So that I meruaile how D. Andrews in his answere to the Apology of Bellarmine, could say that it is a sclaunder, that Wiclif taught so; when as not only Catholiks, but euen Hussites and Protestants do affirme it. Moreouer Wiclif (as Osiander reporteth in the place aforecited) did condemne lawfull oathes, and taught, that all things fell out according to absolute necessity. And Melanchon in his sayd epistle giueth this sentence of him: *I haue looked into VViclif, but I haue found in him many other errors, by which one may iudge of his spirit. He at all vnderstood not, nor held the iustice of fayth. He fondly confoundeth the ghospell and politique affaires; would haue Priests to haue nothing proper, &c.* And in his common places chap. of Ecclesiasticall power: *That superstition of VViclif is pernicious and seditious, which driueth the ministers of the Church to beg-*

Cani. lect. antiq. to. 3.

Wiclife held not iustice of sole faith.

gery.

gery, and denyeth that it is lawfull for them to hold any thing proper. M. Stow also in his Cronicle anno 1376. writeth, that he taught that, *Neither King nor Lay man could give any thing to the church for perpetuity.* Finally Vadianus in his fift book of the Eucharist, pag. 168. confesseth that *in many things he fouly erred.*

Hussites no Protestants.

7. Husse likewise and his partners we prove, not to haue byn true and absolute Protestants. First, because it cannot be proued, that they held the foresayd article of iustification by only fayth, and the other fundamentall points of Protestancy. Secondly, because Husse is by name reiected of Luther, who in the defence of his 30. article tom. 2. thus writeth of him: *He agreeth not with me. He gaue not a litle to the idol of Rome. He seemeth not to repugne against the Popes Monarchy.* And vpon the 2. psal. tom. 3. fol 395: Husse did not condemne the sacrifice of Masse, as we do. And vpon the 9. chapter of Isaias tom. 4. fol. 108. he sayth, that Husse held a doctrine most pestilent, most pernicious, horrible, and wholy impious, yea very diuelish. And in his Lypsicall dispute tom. 1. fol. 260: *I know, and that very well, that an euill Prelate is not to be reiected, and therefore I damne the article of Husse.* And both there and other where, oftentymes denieth himselfe to be a Bohemian, by which he meant an Hussite. And in histable-talkes chapter of Suermers sayth: *Husse believed that works with fayth do iustify*; which point alone excludeth him from the number of Protestants. And in the chapter of Antichrist: *Husse departed not one iot from the Papists, but only reproued vices and naughty life.* Which also affirmeth Hierome of Prage, Husse his fellow, in M. Fox, vpon the 11. chapter of the Apocal. Where also M. Fox himselfe writeth, that

Tom. 1. fo. 391. 392. 431.

Husse believe not sole faith.

Husse

Husse agreed with the Papists touching transubstantiation, Masse, Vowes, Predestination, Free will, formed fayth, cause of iustification, and merits of works: which plainly declare how litle he held of Protestancy. Lastly when Bellarmine wrote, that there was not in the world, when Luther began, any religion but Paganisme, Iudaisme, Mahometisme, Grecisme, Nestorianisme, Hussites heresy, and the Romane fayth; D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 5. cap. 3. pag. 502. denyeth these to have byn all; For (fayth he) *our Church was then.* In which words he professeth the Protestants to be a different church from the Hussites. Iunius also lib. 4. de Eccles. cap. 6. acknowledgeth that some Protestant deny Hussites to be of their Church. And Luther vpon the 53. Chapter of Isaias tom. 4. fol. 220. thus writeth: *There is no religion in the world which receiueth this opinion of iustification* (by only fayth) *and we our selues in priuate do scant beleeue it, though we publikely defend it.* By which words he sheweth, that neither Hussytes, nor Waldenses, nor any Christians besides Protestants, and scarce they also, do beleeue the principall and most fundamentall article of Protestancy, howsoeuer openly they professe it.

That

That the Church cannot be so inuisible, as Protestants confesse their to haue byn before Luthers tyme.

CHAP. VI.

1. BY the name of the Church, we vnderstand not (as I sayd before) only the men, but men sociated, or the society of men, in the fayth & worship of God. Wherfore that a church be sayd visible, not only the men, but their worship of God must be visible. Neither by this word *visible*, do I vnderstand here, that only which can be seene, but whatsoeuer is sensible; according both to the vulgar phrase of speach, wherewith we say: *See how it soundeth*, as S. Augustine noteth, and also after the phrase of scripture, wherein, as the same holy Doctour obserueth: *All sensible things are called visible*. And Protestants, (as is before the wed) do confesse that before Luthers rising their Church was simply inuisible, and vnseene of any, either of those within or without her. And necessarily they must say so, because they can name none at all, who before Luther arose, did see a company of men, who professed to beliue iustification by only fayth, and the rest of the fundamentall principles of Protestancy: yea they affirmed, that it was so inuisible, as it implyed contradiction to haue byn seene of any.

Lib. 10. Confess. c. 35.

Lib. 1. de mor. Manich. c. 20.

Ca. 4. n. 23.

That the Church cannot be inuisible.

2. Now that the Church Militant or liuing on earth cannot be so inuisible, I proue; first, because it is against an article of fayth of diuers Protestants. And if perhaps any hereupon imagine, that either Prot-

Protestants neuer graunted the contrary, or that if they did graunt it, their testimonies against themselues are not to be accepted; let him read what hereafter I write touching that matter, in the last chapter of this booke. Wherefore in the Confession of Saxony cap. 15. they professe in this sort: *God will haue the Ministery of the ghospell to be publike, he will not haue the voice of the ghospell to be shut vp only in corners; but will haue it heard of all mankind. Therefore he will haue publike and seemely meetings, and in them he will haue the voice of the ghospell to sound. He will also haue these same meetings to be witnesses of the Confession and separation of the Church from the sects and opinions of other Nations. God will haue his Church to be seene and heard in the world, and will haue her deuided by many publik marks from other people.* And the same they repeat in the Consent of Polony cap. de Cœna. And the same Confession of Saxony cap. of the Church: *We speake not of the Church as of a Platonicall idea, but we shew a Church, which may be seene and heard. The eternall Father will haue his Sonne to be heard in all mankind. Wherefore we say, that the Church is in this life a visible company &c.* Secōdly it is against their owne definitions of a militant Church. For the foresayd Confession of Saxony definieth the Church in this life to be a visible company. The Magdeburgians in their 1. Century lib. 1. c. 4. col. 170. do thus write: *The Church may be thus defined: The Church in this life, is a company of those, who imbrace the sincere doctrine of the Ghospell, and rightly vse the Sacraments.* And the very same definition giueth Melanchton tom. 4. in cap. 3. 1. ad Tim. pag. 298. Hutterus in his Analysis of the confession of Ausburg pag. 444. saith: *This Church, which is sayd to be, and to be beleiued, is not a Platonicall idea, but the visible company of those, that are called.* Zanchius also in his treatise of the Church cap. 2:

Protestāts definitiōs of the Church.

The Church in this life.

The Church which we beleiue.

Church militant. *The militant Church is the company of the elect, and truly faythfull, professing the same fayth, partaking the same Sacraments, &c. Hereof properly speake the scriptures, when they call the Church the spouse of Christ, the body of Christ, redeemed with the bloud of Christ, founded vpon a rock.* Gerlachius tom. 2. Disput. 22: *Defining the Church, as it is on earth, we say that*

Church on earth. *it is a congregation of men, who called by the voice of the Ghospell, heare the word of God, and vse the Sacraments instituted of Christ.*

3. Thirdly it is against the properties and markes of the true Church assigned by the Protestants themselues, to be altogether inuisible. For thus their Confession of Ausburg cap. 7: *The Church of*

The proper Church. *Christ properly so called, hath her marks, to wit, pure doctrine, &c.* The Confession of Saxony cap. 12: *The true church is discerned from other nations, by the voice of true doctrine, and*

The true Church. *lawfull vse of Sacraments.* The French Confession art. 27: *VVe believe that the true church ought to be discerned with great care. VVherefore we affirme out of the word of God, that the Church is the company of the faythfull, who agree in following the word of God, and imbracing true religion: wherein also they daily profit, growing and confirming themselues mutually in the feare of God.* The Confession of the Low Countries art. 29: *By these markes the true Church shall be discerned from the false, if in her the pure preaching of the Ghospell is of force: by these markes it is certaine that the true Church may be distinguished.* The Confession of Scotland art. 18: *It is necessary that the true Church be discerned from the false, by euident marckes, least being deceiued we imbrace the false for the true, to our eternall damnation.* Againe: *VVe believe the markes of the true Church to be true preaching of the word, &c.* Melanchon in his answere to the Bauarian articles tom. 3. fol. 362: *It is euident, that the true Church is a visible company.* And vpon the 16. to the Romans tom. 1. pag.

486: She is the true Church, who teacheth the Ghospell aright, and rightly administreth the Sacraments. Danæus in his booke of Anticnritt, cap. 17: This is the proper definition of the Church, that the true Church is the company of the faythfull, who serue God purely, and keep the notes of adoption instituted by him, such as are the heauenly word, the Sacraments and discipline. By these 3. marks the false Church is distinguished from the true. Lubbert in his 4. booke of the Church cap. 2: We say that the Church doth shew her selfe to be the true Church, by the sincere preaching of the word of God. And Beza wrote a booke of this title: Of the true and visible marks of the Catholike Church. D. Whitaker in answere of the 3. reason of F. Campian: That we iudge to be proper to the true Church, that it increase and conserue Christs word, that it vse the Sacraments entirely and purely. These we defend to be the most true and essentiall properties of the Church. Take these away and you will leaue nothing but the carcasse of the church. Againe: They containe the true nature of the church, which if they be present, they make the church, and take it away, if they be taken away. And D. Feild in his 1. book of the church cap. 11: We say, that that society wherein that outward profession of the truth of God is preserued, is that true church of God, &c. Finally to omit the words of others, the same teach Wigand in his method of doctrine cap. 19. Gesner in his 24. place of the Church, The Magdeburgians in the Preface of their 6. Cētury, Hesthusius in cap. 1. 1. ad Cor. Soterius in his method, title of the church, Pelargus in his Compend. of diuinity loc. 7. Sohnius in his Thesis of the Church, Bullinger in his Catechisme fol. 44. Aretius in his place part. 3. fol. 50. Theses of Geneua disput. 74. Thus thou seest (good reader) that according to the manifold iudgement of Protestants, a part of the definition, of the essence, the marke of the Church in this life,

The proper definition of the Church.

Summe of Protest. former Cōfessiōs.

life, of the Church militant, of the Church which is believed, of the proper Church, of the Church whereof the Scripture properly speaketh, when it calleth her the spouse of Christ, the body of Christ; of the true Church, of the Church properly so termed, and finally of the Catholike Church; that (I say, it is of the definition and essence, a marke of this church, to be a visible company professing the faith, partaking the Sacraments, mutually confirming themselues, and that otherwise it is (as they say) but a carcasse of the Church. Wherefore it implieth manifest contradiction, that there should at any tyme haue byn a true Church, and not a visible company: because nothing can be without all its essentiall parts. The Protestant Church therefore, which (as we head) was before Luthers tyme altogeather invisible, was no true and proper Church, but (to vse their termes) a Platonicall idæa, or a carkasse of a Church. If any reply, that when Protestants affirme the foresayd definitions, properties, and marks of the true Church; they meane not by the name of the true Church that which is simply and absolutely the true Church, but that which is the true visible Church; I aske, why then do they simply call it the true Church, if they do not so meane? why are not their words conformable to their meaning? Besides, the Church whereof they giue the foresayd definitions and marks, they call not only the true Church, but also the Church properly so termed, the spouse and body of Christ, the Catholike church, and such like, which cannot agree to any, which is but a Church in appearance only, and in the sight of men, but only to that which is the Church in very deed, and in the sight of God. Further more, according to the

opinion

opinion of Protestants these two termes *True* and *Visible*, in the nature of the Church do one destroy the other; as these two, *True* and *Painted*, exclude each other in the nature of a man. For they imagine that the true Church is a society in something that is inuisible, to wit in iustification and predestination. Wherupon they deny any ill or reprobate Christians to be of the true Church. Wherefore, as he should speake fondly, who should say *A true painted man*; so, according to their owne opinion, they speake as fondly, when they say *The true visible Church*. But as we can only say, the true picture of a man, attributing the word *True*, to the picture, not to the man; so they should only, *The true appearance or shew of the Church*, giuing the word *True* to the shew, not to the Church it selfe. But they are ashamed to speak so, least when they inquire the marks of the true visible Church, it should appeare, that they seeke not the marks of the true Church indeed, but only of the shew, shadow, or shape of the Church. And yet in very truth they seeke but the marks of the shadow of the church. For the inuisible Church, consisting only of the iust and elect, which alone they will haue to be the true Church; hath no certaine marks; else we should know certainly who were the iust and elect. And this themselues confesse; for thus writeth D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 5. cap. 8: *The question is not of the marks of the inuisible Church*. Againe: *We say the marks of the Catholike Church simply so called, are knowne to God alone.* And D. Humfrey to 3. reason of F. Campian pa. 281. sayth that the marks *do not reach vnto the nature of the true Church*. And the reason is manifest, because (as I sayd) other wise we should know who were the iust and elect.

Why Protestants somtyme call the visible visible Church the true Church.

Protestants giue no marks of the true & Catholike Church.

4. If any againe reply, that when Protestants say, *The true visible Church*, they meane the visible Church true in doctrine, in which speach there is no contradiction according to their owne opinion, because they admit, that the visible Church, (that is, the society in true doctrine and right vse of Sacraments, into which Church or society the wicked or reprobate may enter,) may be true in doctrine, though they graunt not, that such a Church or society be the true Church in nature or essence. Which perhaps Vorstius meant, in his Antibellarm. pa. 180. when he sayd: *The outward Church is not without cause called the true church of Christ by reason of the profession of true doctrine*. I answere, if they so meant, why did they not speak so? were they ignorant, that it is one thing to be true in doctrine or in speach, and another to be true in nature? as a lyer is a true man in nature of man, but not true in his speach. Or if they did know this, why did they abuse the words and their hearers? Moreouer, though in this sense their words did not destroy themselues, as they did in the former, yet fondly should they (as they vse to do) assigne the truth of doctrine for the marke of the true Church in doctrine. For this were to assigne a thing for a mark of it self; as if to know a true man of his word, one should giue this marke, that it is such as speaketh truth. Besides this were rather to define what is a true man, then to giue the marke to know who is a true man. And yet marks are giuen to know which is the true Church, not what is the nature of the true Church.

5. If yet any reply, that the visible Church or society in profession of true doctrine and right vse of Sacraments, is termed of Protestants the true Church,

Church, not because this Church or society is of it selfe the true church or the society instituted by God, but because alwayes in, or vnder it there is the true Church, to wit the society in iustice and predestination; by reason that in euery company of them that professe true doctrine and rightly vse the Sacraments, there are some, who are sociated and vnited in iustice and predestination. Which D. Whitaker intimateth, when Cont. 2. quest. 4. cap. 1. pag. 485. he sayth: *The visible Church, which holdeth and professeth true sayth, is the true Church only of the part of the elect and predestinated:* I answere, that this supposeth a thing doubtfull, and perhaps false. For what certainty can there be, that in euery particuler company of them who professe the true sayth & rightly vse the Sacraments, there is alwayes a cõpany of the iust and elect; when as Christ sayth: *Many are called but few are chosen*, especially, if (as Protestants say) one or two make a church. Surely Danæus Cont. 4. pag. 689. seemeth to deny this, saying: *These visible companies are sometymes a part of that* (true) *Church, sometymes none.* But admit that in euery company of true professors there be alwayes a company of iust and elect, what reason were this, to terme the society in profession of true sayth, the true Church, if in deed the society in iustice & predestination be the only true Church. This would suffice to say, that the apparent Church could neuer be separated from the true Church, but not to call that society the true Church, which indeed is only the outward appearance of the true Church. And much lesse would it suffice, to call it the church properly so termed, the spouse and body of Christ, the Catholike Church, the Church which we professe to belieue; as the Protestants haue termed the visible Matt. 22.

Church. Neither can these epithets or names be giuen to any other society, then to that which hath the true nature and substance of the Church indeed; because they signify as properly and expresly that only Church; as the can be expressed of vs by any words whatsoeuer. And sith Protestants haue giuen them all to the visible church, they must needs confesse that shee hath the nature and substance of the very true Church indeed; and consequently that an inuisible Church is no true Church indeed.

Protestats somtymes say that thechurch cannot be inuisible.

6. Fourthly I proue that the Church cannot be inuisible, because oftentymes Protestants do confesse it. The Apology of the Confession of Ausburg chap. of the Church: *The Church is principally the society of fayth and of the holy Ghost in the hearts, which yet hath her outward markes, that she may be knowne.* Luther vpon the 4. chap. of Genesis tom. 6. fol. 56: *The Church was neuer so voyd of externall marks, that it could not be not knowne where God was certainly to be found.* And vpon 51. psalm. tom. 3. fol. 474: *For Christ will not lye hid in the world, but will be preached; not between wals, but vpon the house top.* Melanchon vpon the 11. of Daniel tom. 2. pag. 511: *It is necessary, that the Church be a visible company.* Againe: *We feigne not an inuisible Church, like to a Platonicall idea.* And in the Preface of his 3. tome, he thinketh it so absurd to put an inuisible Church, as he sayth: *To whatsoeuer doth that perdigious speach, which denyeth that there is any visible Church.* We must needs confesse a visible Church. And vpon the 3. chap. 1. Tim. tom. 4. pag. 398: *Others* (sayth he) *setting aside wholy the externall shew, do speake of an inuisible Church, as of a Platonicall idea, which is no where seene or heard.* Kemnice in his common places title of the Church cap. 3: *God will haue vs to know, where and which is the Church. Therefore she must be knowne, not to God*

Monstruous to say the Church was inuisible.

only,

only, but also to vs; and thereupon is defined to be the visible company of them, who imbrace the Ghospell of Christ, and rightly vse the Sacraments: Iames Andrews in his book against Hosius pag. 210: *We are not ignorant, that the church must be a visible company of teachers and hearers.* Againe: *The Church is, and is called a company of men, chosen of God, in which the word of God soundeth incorrupt, &c.* Hunnius in his treatise of Freewill pag. 91: *God in all tymes hath placed his Church as in a high place, and hath exalted it in the sight of all people and Nations.* Hutter in his Analysis of the Confession of Aulpurg, pag. 430: *The elect are not the whole Church, no if you speake only of the true church. For the church consisteth not only of inward faythin Christ, but also of the outward administration of the word & Sacraments. Now as farre as this in outward rite is performed, so farre the true Church truly is visible.* Beurlin in the Preface of his Refutation of Sotus: *I confesse the Church of Christ is alwayes to be acknowledged visible.* And he addeth, that all confesse the same. The same doctrine is taught by Gesner loc. 24. by Adam Francis in his 11. place, and by other Lutherans. Amongst the Sacramentaries thus writeth Vrsin in Prolegomenis ad Catechesin pag. 2: *The Church must needs be seene in this world, that the elect may know vnto what company they must adioyne themselues in this life.* Iunius Cont. 4. lib. 3. cap. 13. affirmeth, that it is impious to say that the Church can wholy want a visible forme. Keckerman in the 3. book of his Theologicall systeme writeth, that the Church *must always be sensible, that other nations may know to what church they ought to adioyne themselues*; and that Confession of sincere doctrine can never faile wholy, nor the visible church wholy erre. Danæus in his booke of the visible Church dareth to say, that *who denieth the true church of God, and that visible, to have byn from the beginning of the*

world, he without doubt sheweth himselfe to be ignorant in holy scripture. Amongst our English Protestants M. Hooker in his 3. booke of Ecclesiasticall policy pag. 126: *God hath had euer, & euer shall haue some Church visible vpon earth.* D. Feild in his 1. booke of the Church cap. 10: *For seing the Church is the multitude of them that shall be saued, and no man can be saued vnlesse he make Confession vnto saluation (for fayth hid in the heart and concealed doth not suffice) it cannot be, but they that are of the true Church, must by profession of the truth make themselues knowne, in such sort that by their profession and practise they may be discerned from other men.* And D. White in defence of his Way cap. 4. pag. 390: *I acknowledge the prouidence of God, who hath left the records of history to confirme our fayth, and freely graunt our religion to be false, if the continuall descent thereof from Christ cannot by such record be shewed.* Moreouer at sometyms they not only confesse that the Church is alwayes visible, but also graunt that the scripture teacheth the same in those parables of the barne and the net. For out of them Caluin 4. Institut. cap. 1. § 13. inferreth that the *Lord pronounceth, that the church shall be vexed with this euill till the day of iudgemẽt, to be burdened with the mixture of the wicked.* Of the same opinion is D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 3. cap. 2. pag. 471. and others. But that church which contayneth the wicked, is the visible Church, for the inuisible they will haue to hold only the good. The Scripture therefore testifieth that the visible Church shall euer be. Yea Protestants now and then take it so ill, that it should be sayd, that they teach that the visible Church perished for many ages, that D. Sutliue in his answere to Exceptions cap. 7. sayth that Bellarmine lyeth in saying so. And D. Whitaker loc. cit. pag. 472. sayth, *we slaunder them, when we affirme they put such a Church, as at sometymes can be seene of none.*

Protestãts confesse that the Scripture affirmeth that the Church is alwayes visible.

And

And sayth, that in this matter there is no controuersy about the thing, but about the manner, to wit, no question whither the Church be alwayes visible or no, but in what manner it is visible; because forsooth we will haue the Church to be at all tymes visible clearly, and of all men; and they will haue it to be at sometymes visible but obscurely, and of few. The like sayth Kemnice in his Common places title of the Church cap. 3. Reineccius in the 4. tome of his Armour cap. 8. and D. Morton in the 1. part of his Apology lib. 1. cap. 13. But yet that in this matter we neither bely nor slaunder them, is manifest by what we haue rehearsed in the 4. chapter before going in the 5. number, and those that follow. To which I add, that Caluin in the Preface of his institutions setteth the state of this question betwixt vs & Protestants in these words: *Vpon this hinge hangeth our controuersy, that they* (Papists) *will haue the forme of the church to appeare and be visible at all tymes: On the contrary we say, that the church may consist of no apparent forme.* And I would to God, that Protestants would constantly agree, which vs in this matter of doctrine, that the church of God is alwayes visible to some, either of those that are in it, or out of it; that the debate might remaine only about the matter of fact, whither the Protestāt Church before Luther appeared, were seene of any either Protestant or other. But Protestants standing betwixt truth and lyes, whiles they consider the nature of the Church of God, especially as it is described in scripture, confesse that it must needs be visible, not only to her children but to others also. But when they look back vpon the state and condition of their owne church before Luther began, are compelled to deny the same, as before we most euidently

VVhy Protestāts contradict themselues about the inuisibility of the Church.

shewed

shewed: which thing alone, if it were well considered, would discouer sufficiently, that in their own consciences they acknowledge their Church not to be the true Church of God.

Inuisibility cõtrary to the ends of the Church.

7. Fiftly, I proue that the Church cannot be inuisible, because that were contrary to the ends for which the Church was instituted of God: whereof one was, that men should worship him after that entier manner of worship which man is to giue, which is to honour God not only with heart and mind, but also with tongue and deed, as it is euident; and Caluin in his Confutation of a Hollander, many wayes proueth that the Church must render to God, not only inward but also outward worship. But an inuisible Church worshippeth God only in heart and mind, as Whitakers words are. Another end of the Church is to feed her children with the word and Sacraments, to correct and gouerne them by discipline, and to defend them from enemies; as also is manifest and scripture teacheth. Which offices, a Church, which neither seeth her children, nor is seene of them, cannot performe. Likewise another end is to conuert the world, and those who are out of her, to the fayth and worship of God; which she can no way do, if neither her doctrine nor example be seene of them. And yet as Luther sayth vpon the sixt chapter of Isaias tom. 4. fol. 234: *The Church is in perpetuall practise of conuerting others to the fayth.*

Inuisibility against the nature of humane societies.

8. Sixtly, it is against the nature of a society of men amongst themselues, for to be inuisible. For as men consist of a body which is visible by the colours, and of a soule which is seene by the actions thereof; so it is necessary that the society in which they

they ioyne, be visible, either by it selfe, or by some other thing. Whereupon well sayd S. Augustin: *Men cannot ioyne in any religion true or false, vnlesse they be bound together by some fellowship of visible signes or Sacraments.* And the same confesseth Gerlachius in his 23. disput. of the Church pag. 995. saying: *VVe willingly confesse & graunt, that the church cannot be, except there be some outward and visible signes, by common communion and participation whereof society amongst men may consist.* And seauently it is contrary to the example of all other societies amongst men whither religious or prophane, whereof none consisteth in a thing which is altogeather inuisible, and whereby the members of that society cannot be knowne the one to the other. Li. 19. cont. Faust. ma.

9. Seauenthly, it is contrary to the continuance and conseruation of the Church on earth to be visible. For if the Church which was in the former age had not byn seene of that which is in this age, how could the Church of this age haue receiued the fayth? We aske therefore, how the Protestant Church of our age learned the fayth of the Church of an other age, if in the ages before Luther she were so inuisible as you haue heard them confesse: Protestants scared with this question like men with a thunder clap, leape a sunder, and euery one answereth, not what he knoweth or can proue, but what seemeth to him least absurd, that hereby we may perceiue, that all their talke of their Churches being before Luthers tyme, is but as the scripture sayth, fables and vaine speaches, or fancies and fictions of men, speaking without either testimony or reason. Some of them say, that before Luther their Church receiued the fayth immediatly from God alone. Denying Popery (sayth Boysseul in his Confutation of Spond. Against the perpetuity of the Church.

protestant Church taught miraculously.

Spondé pag. 75) *the holy Ghost taught fayth without a preacher.* The same also intimate Iunius Cont. 4. lib. 3. ca. 13. M. Perkins in his exposition of the Creed Col. 788. The Author of the church in Danæus Opuscles pag. 1029. D. Fulk of Succession pag. 320. and others, who say, that the Church *VVas propagated and receiued fayth by extraordinary meanes.* And they also, who write, that their Church was preserued *miraculously, meruellously, by wondrous meanes, or by meere miracle*; as Luther of priuate Masse tom. 7. fol 240. Caluin 4. Instit. cap. 1. §. 2. Sadeel ad Repetit. Sophism. Turriani pag. 763. Danæus of Antichrist pag. 1021. & Sonis against Spondé cap. 2. pag. 36. But this their assertion they neither do, nor can proue otherwise, then because God can in such manner preserue the church.

10. Thou seest (gentle reader) vpon what a vaine foundation this imaginary church is built, for the space of many ages, in which it lay inuisible and lurcking in holes & corners. For they confesse, that for many ages it was not seene of any man; and if at any tyme they confesse not so much in words, in deeds they confesse it alwayes; because they can neuer name any, whom they can proue to haue seene it in former ages; and neuertheles they will, that for al those ages it learnt their fayth miraculously and immediatly from God alone. When we aske testimony hereof, they produce neither diuine nor humane worthy of credit; when we demaund proofe, they giue vs no other then this, that God could so teach it fayth. As if God did, or doth all that he can do. We speake of an effect, or a matter of fact, of Gods will; and they answere of his power. When we affirme any thing, they exact demonstrations, that is, plaine testimonies of Scripture, or at least pregnant proofes

Perkins Catholol. pag. 488. Fulke de Succes. pa. 342.

proofes deduced thence. And when they affirme a matter of so great weight and so incredible, as is that the church was so many ages taught her faith of God alone, they will haue vs to beleiue it, not only without any testimony of God or man, but euen contrary to the testimony of them both, for one silly sophisme, ridiculous to the very children, and scorned euen of themselues in other matters, as shall by and by appeare. Surely that I may vse Saint Augustins words: *They seeme to thinke, that they haue not to do with men, but as if they were meere beasts, who heare the or read their writings, they abuse the ignorance or dulnesse of them, or rather their blindnes of mind.* Or as Caluin sayth: *These maisters need haue a heard of Oxen, if they would haue auditors to whome they may perswade what they will.* But to their Argument I say with Tertullian against Praxeas cap. 10: *Surely nothing is hard to God. But if in our presumptions we will so rashly vse this sentence, we may feigne any thing of God; as if he had done, it because he could do it. But we must not beleiue he hath done that, which he hath not, because he can do all things: but we must seeke whether he hath done it or no.* Luther also vpon the 46. cap of Genesis tom. 6 fol. 624. saith: *God can gouerne the church by the holy Ghost, without the Ministery; but he will not do this immediatly.* And vpon the 32. chap. fol. 454: *He could by the holy Ghost inwardly enlighten the hearts and forgiue sinnes without the Ministery of the word and Ministers; but he would not.* And the Confession of Suitzers cap. 18: *God by his power can immediatly gather a church of men, but he chose rather to deale with men by the ministery of men.* Caluin vpon 3. chap. 1. Cor. v. 6: *Nothing hindereth God that he may not inspire sayth into men asleep; but he hath otherwise determined, to wit that, that sayth should come by hearing.* And vpon 1. chap. of S. Luke v. 37: *They runne peruerselv who imagine of Gods power without his word. It is a dangerous disputing what*

Cor. Allmant. 8. 4.

Antid. Conc. 2. 23.

what God can do, vnleſſe withall we find what he will do. And 4. Inſtitut. cap. 17. §. 24. he ſayth: *VVe aske not here what God could, but what he would do.* The like words he hath cap. 1. §. 5. lib. 2. cap. 7. pag. 5. and de vera Eccleſ. Reform. pag. 326. Beza in the 2. part of his anſwere to the Acts of the Conference at Montbelgard pag. 97: *An argument taken from the power of God needeth no anſwere, vnleſſe his will alſo appeare to vs by his word.* The Author of the orthodoxall conſent in the Preface: *it is ridiculous to vrge the omnipotency of God, where we know not his pleaſure.* Sadeel of Sacramentall manducation pag. 272. ſetteth downe this as a Theologicall principle: *VVe maynot in diuinity argue from the omnipotency of God, vnleſſe his will be before declared by his expreſſe word.* Let Proteſtants therfore produce Gods expreſſe word, wherin he ſayth, that he hath, or will for many ages miraculouſly by himſelfe alone teach the Church her fayth. Danæus alſo in his 4. booke de amiſſ. grat. cap. 15: *It litle auaileth to proue Gods power, vnleſſe his will alſo be proued.* And D. Whitaker cont. 2. queſt. 6. cap. 1 p. 617: *VVhat a kind of argument is this? This may be done, becauſe nothing is impoſſible to God, therefore it is done, or ſometymes hath byn? Doth our fayth rely vpon ſuch foundations?* Finally Caſaubon in his 7. Exercitation againſt Baronius: *It is a ſaying of the Fathers that Gods power is the refuge of Heretikes.* Thus thou ſeeſt how vaine, euen by the Proteſtants iudgement, is this proofe of the Churches learning immediatly from God. They are wont to ſcoffe at the Miracles done by Saints, albeit we proue them by ſufficient teſtimony of man: & themſelues feigne a continuall miracle, yea ſo many miracles, as they feigne men, whome they lay for many ages learne their fayth immediatly of God; which they cannot proue by no ſufficient teſtimony, either of God or man.

men. For we will most manifestly make it appeare. Here I will only note, that the Protestants seeme to have byn some Enthusiasts or heavenly Prophets, as Luther seemingly termed some, when in his time challenged such immediat learning from God: and that the Protestants themselves do sometymes condemne this immediat learning from God, as Fanaticall, Anabaptisticall, Suenckfeldian, and Enthusiasticall.

11. The Confession of Ausburg art. 5. (as Fabritius relateth out of the originall copy) sayth thus: *They condemne the Anabaptists and others, who think that the holy Ghost cometh to men without the outward word.* Martin Luther upon Genesis tom. 6. fol. 117. *The holy ghost doth not teach new revelations besides the ministery of the word, according as the Enthusiasts and Anabaptists the Fanaticall Doctours do dreame.* And in the 8. art. of Smalcald: *It is the way must constantly stand, that God will not otherwise deale with us, then by the vocall word and Sacraments.* Schusselburg also in the 10. tome of his Catalogue pag. 30. reherseth it is an errour of Suenckfeld, that men may be saved without the outward word of God and Ministery. And Melanct hon in his answere to the Bauarian Articles tom. 3. fol. 372. affirmeth, that it is the opinion of Suenckfeld and the Anabaptists: *That God communicateth himself to men without the ministery of the word.* Mennice in the 3 part of his answere title of the Sacrament of Orders pag. 391: *I justly find fellow of Enthusiasts and Anabaptists, who imagin the necessity of the outward ministery not to be needfull.* And title of Penance pag. 376: *The Enthusiasts are condemned, who feigne that God forgiveth sinnes immediatly, and without the use of the ministery.* D. Whitaker Cont. 3. quæst. 3. c. 11. pag. 331: *We only reject revelations, which are besides the word of God.*

Protestats reiect immediat teaching of God.

Mathical,

mystical, Anabaptistical and altogether heretical. And in his 2. booke of the Scripture cap. 3. sect. 1. pag. 44: *We must expect no more immediat revelation. It is so.* And he addeth, that Protestants bisse out all those who pretend these kind of revelations. And in the 2. book cap. 10. sect. 4: *VV hy are the Anabaptists held for Heretiks, if the church do know matters of fayth without all externall meanes by the enlyghtning of the holy Ghost?* Pareus in his 3. booke de Iustificat. cap. 3: *The exception which they make of speciall revelation, is a meere iest. For besides the Prophets, Apostles, & some few Apostolicall men, God doth not deale, nay hath dealt with speciall revelation; but with ordinary, and will have the Church to be content with the word and the holy Ghost working in the hearts of the faythfull.* And cap. 8: *God will not have his church to be taught and confirmed by Enthusiasticall revelations; but by hearing of his word and ordinary vse of the Sacraments.* Finally Beza in the Conference of Montbelgard pag. 407. saith: *That we have no testimony in scripture of extraordinary meanes of infusing fayth.* Besides, it was the fashion of both old and new heretiks to boast of speciall revelations. Of old heretiks witnesseth S. Augustin in his booke of heresies; and Caluin in his booke of true Reformation pag. 322. Of Munster, Carolstade, and the Sacramentaries Luther testifieth the same vpon the 22. of Esaiæ tom. 4. fol. 280. Of Gentilis, Caluin in his booke against him. Of Storcke, Manlius in his Common places pag. 483. Of Peucer, and Bergius, Schusselburb. lib. 4. Theol. Caluin. art. 1. pag. 172. that I may say nothing of Luther, Zuinglius, and Caluin.

The Protestant Church not taught by ordinary meanes.

12. Others therefore teach that the Protestant church before Luther, received the fayth, not by any extraordinary way, but by ordinary meanes, to wit, by hearing some true doctrine of Papish preachers,

and some by reading scriptures: Thus D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 3. cap. 2. pag. 424. Behold new tables and fictions (for we are like to beare no other kind of stuffe of Protestants in these matters of fact) not only lesse proued then the former, but also lesse probable or possible. For it was at least possible, that God alone should haue taught his church; but that before Luthers reuolt either Popish or Protestanticall preachers, or the Scripture should haue taught Protestancy, hath neither shew of probability nor possibility. Not Protestant preachers, because before Luther there were none at all, as hereafter both D. Whitaker and others shall confesse. For the present it may suffice, that Luther vpon the 22. psalm. tom. 3. fol. 344. writeth: *That there was left only the scripture, and that comprised not in voice, but in letters, by which we might restore our selues to the fayth.* And Against Catarine tom. 2. fol. 140. he sayth, that *the vocall ghospell, being choked and extinguished by Papists, was silent in all the world.* Neither could the Scripture teach Protestancy, not only because it teacheth no such doctrine, but also because it plainly professeth, that none can come to fayth but by hearing of preachers lawfully sent, as hereafter we shall see Protestants do confesse. In the meane tyme it may suffice, that Dauæus in his book of the visible church pag. 1069. writeth, that *S. Paul sayth that fayth commeth by hearing, not by priuate reading*; and that we open a gap to Fanaticall spirits for to contemne their Pastors, if we say that reading alone will suffice to get fayth; which Protestants haue experienced. For thus writeth Luther in the Preface of his Catechisme tom. 5. fol. 645. *There are found some this day euen of the Nobility, who dare say, we need no more Pastors or preachers; that bookes suffice out of which euery one may learne the same things by himselfe*

Rom. 10.

selfe without any mans teaching. And Caluin vpon the 2. Thess. cap. 4: *Certaine phanaticall fellowes do brag, that they need no more the help of teachers, because reading may abunde enough suffice.*

13. Neither could those imaginary Protestants learne Protestancy of Popish preachers. First, because Protestants, (as before his shewed) cõplaine, that Papists had extinguished all their fayth. Against because now no man learneth Protestancy of Popish preachers, and besides because Papistry and Protestancy are directly opposite; as Luther sayth in cap. 3. Michæ tom. 4. fol. 446. and tom. 7. epist. ad Esling enses, and against King Henry tom. 2. fol. 497: Or (as Brentius speaketh in his Apology of the Confession of Wittenberg pag. 703) *they differ in the very principle:* or (as Beza writeth in his Confession cap. 7. pag. 56) *In the very summe of salvation.* And as D. Whitaker affirmeth in his oration that the Pope is Antichrist, *Papistry is more repugnant to Protestantisme, then hoat to cold, blacke to white.* How then is it possible that they should haue learnt Protestancy of Papists, who teach so cõtrary doctrine. Lastly because Protestants themselues deny it. For Luther vpon the Graduall psalmes tom. 3. fol. 516. thus writeth: *In Popery there was neuer heard one pure word of sinne, of grace, of the merit of Christ.* And fol. 568: *Vnder the Pope all pulpits, all Churches did sound out nothing but wicked doctrine.* And in cap. 2. ad Galat. tom. 1. fol. 297: *Seeing Papists know not what fayth is, it is impossible that they should haue fayth, and much lesse teach it to others.* And the Apology of the Confession of Ausburg in the Preface: *No man taught, that sinnes were remitted by fayth in Christ.* Caluin 4. Instit. cap. 2. 6. 2. say th, that in Popery *the doctrine without which Christianity cannot stand was all buryed & cast out.* And in Respons. ad Versipellem pag.

Protestãcy & Popery quit opposite.

pag 360: *In Popery there soundeth the bare and empty name of Christ.* And vpon the 2. cap. 2. Tim: *There was horrible destruction of the gospel in Popery.* Wherfore none learnt the Protestant Ghospell either in Popery, or of Popish preachers. Besides although they cold haue learnt the faith of Popish preachers, yet they should be ashamed to say, that they had learned it of them, whom they account the bondslaues and ministers of Antichrist.

14. Ninthly, I proue that the Church could not be inuisible, because there is nothing which can make that the Church professe not her fayth. For if any thing, most of all persecution. But as the waters did lift vp the Arck of Nõe, which was a figure of the church; so do persecutions raise vp the church, and make her more knowne. And as the heauen in day tyme all shineth, but at might glittereth in the starres, so the church in tyme of peace flourisheth in all her members, but in tyme of persecution is most glorious in her constant soldiers. And there are many and most excellent testimonies of the holy Fathers, how that the Church is by persecution made more pure, more famous, and more plentifull, which one may read in SS. Iustin, Irenæus, Tertullian, Gregory Nazianzen, Hilary, Ambrose, Hierome, Augustin, Leo, Theodorete, Gregory the great, & others. I according to my purpose will alleage only the testimonies of Protestants. Luther vpon the 1. psalme tom. 3. fol. 125: *The faythfull, whiles they are killed do encrease, while they are diminished do multiply.* And vpon the 9. of Isaias tom. 4. fol. 84: *The Church is made fruitfull with the blood of the Godly, and increaseth.* Calvin against Seruet. pag. 595: *The true and proper church rising vnder persecution, flourished vnder the same.* The like he hath vpon

Nothing can make the church inuisible.

the 2. Tim. cap. 2. and Philip 1. Lubbert. lib. 5. de Eccles. cap. 3: *The true Church grew vnder suffering persecutions.* And the Apology of the English Church in the end: *The flame the more it is kept downe, so much the more with greater force and strength doth it breake out and fly abroad.* D. Fulke of Succession pag. 255: *I acknowledge that the Church is so farre from being extinguished by the persecution of the materiall sword, that I graunt it giueth her occasion to delate and extend her bounds. For so, as Tertullian sayth well, the blood of Martyrs is the seed of the Church. Thus all that are not starck blind do see to haue happened to our Church. For how much the more antichrist raged with fire and sword, so much the more famous she became.* And D. Whitaker Cont. 2 quest. 5. cap. 4. pag. 501: *Persecutions destroy not the Kingdome of Christ, but make it more famous.* And Cont. 4. quest. 5. cap. 2. pag. 669: *When tyrants raged against the church, religion suffered no losse; yea then most of all flourished.* How then could the Protestant church, if it were the true church of God, become inuisible before Luther arose, by persecution?

15. If any reply, that this is true of violent persecution of the heathens, but not of persecution by fraud & deceit, as is the persecution of Antichrist, which made the Protestant Church in former tymes to become inuisible: I answere that first he speaketh voluntary without all proofe. Againe, that the English Apology and D. Fulke speake namely of Antichrists persecution, meaning the Pope, which they say hath since Luthers tyme made their church more famous. How then could it before his tyme make it inuisible? Moreouer, the scripture and holy Fathers teach, that Antichrist shall rage most cruelly against the Church: and Protestants affirme that the Pope, whome they will haue to be Antichrist, hath byn so cru-

cruell against Protestants, as any Herode, Nero, Domitian, may seeme to haue byn mild if they be compared to him. Finally, heretikes do by fraud persecute the Church, and neuertheleſſe the Apoſtle ſayth: *There muſt be hereſies, that thoſe whoſe tryall may be made manifeſt.* So farre is fraudulent perſecution from making the Church inuiſible, as it maketh the tried fayth full to be manifeſt. And both S. Auguſtin oftentymes, & others obſerue, that hereſies haue byn occaſion of great increaſe of knowledge vnto the Church. 1. Cor. 11.

16. Tenthly I proue, that the Church cannot become inuiſible, becauſe Proteſtants do often inferre ſuch and ſuch a Church or company not to haue byn, becauſe it was not ſeene; as in the Preface of the Protocoll of Frankentall, they proue the Anabaptiſts were not before the year 1525. *Becauſe* (ſay they) *if you read all ſtories you ſhall find no people from the beginning of the world, who had a Confeſſion of fayth like vnto yours.* But by the ſame manner it were eaſy to proue that Proteſtants were not before Luther. For as Spalatinus in his relation of their Cõfeſſion of Auſpurg boaſteth: *One ſhall not find ſuch a Confeſſion neither in any hiſtory, neither in any ancient Fathers or Doctor.* And Fox in his Proteſtation before his Acts ſayth, that of their Church there is no mention made in Hiſtories. Luther alſo vpon the 3. chap. ad Galat. tom. 5. fol. 358. writeth that of his principall opinion *nothing is read in bookes of Monks, of Canoniſts, of Sabolmen, yea nor in the bookes of ancient Fathers. There was a wonderfull ſilence of it for many ages in all ſchooles and Churches.* Likewiſe, when one ſayd, that the Roman Church was a member of the Catholike Church, Caluin in his Anſwere ad Veſpellem pag. 249. ſayd: *I do not gainſay that the Roman Church is a member of the Catholike, if he could ſhew a Church* Proteſtãts inferre an inuiſible Church to be no Church. In Luther tom. 9. German.

at Rome. Which supposeth that no Church is where it cannot be shewed. When Bellarmine sayd, that besides the Synagogue of the Iewes there were in Elias tyme Churches amongst the Gentils, D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 3. cap. 3. pag. 475. thus answered: *If they say that God had other Churches, let them shew them, and tell which they were, and where they were.* And D. Raynolds in his 12. Prelection vpon the scripture col. 100. inferreth, that none of the Synagogue did beleeue those bookes of Scripture which they deny to be canonicall, because we cannot name any. When D. Harding sayd that there was such an heresy, M. Iewel art. 2. diuis. 8. pag. 75. denying it, sayth: *It must needs be a very strange heresy that neuer had neither beginning nor ending, nor defender nor reprouer, nor mouth to speake it, nor eare to heare it, nor pen to write, nor tyme to last in, nor place to rest in.* And if an heresy must be heard of, certainly much more the Church of God. When Beza impugned the Arians, thus he discourseth epist. 18. pag. 98: *If their opinion be true, we bid them shew where there Church hath lyen hidde from the propagation of the ghospell it is easy to demonstrate, that neuer any one held any such thing, who was not condemned by the perpetuall consent of the Church.* And he addeth epist. 81: *Certainly there hath lyen no true Church, if these men teach truth.* When the Bohemians would proue that they had borrowed nothing of the Anabaptists, thus they write in the Preface of their Confession: *Our Congregation was long tyme before any thing was heard of the Anabaptists, or their name knowne in the world.* Finally M. Bancroft in his Survey of the pretended discipline cap. 2. auoucheth, that the Genevian discipline began at Caluin, because, before him it was neuer seene nor heard of. And if they think that a discipline, or a heretical company could be, and not be seene or heard

heard of in the world, how much more ought they to think the same of the Church of God?

17. Lastly I proue that the Church of God could not be inuisible, because thereupon would ensue many and great absurdities. For first, if the visible Church should faile, it is manifest that it is not the Church of Christ, against which he hath promised, that the very gates of hell shall not preuaile. And if it be graunted, that the visible Church is not the Church instituted by Christ, it must needs be but a humane society instituted by men. How then should it come to passe, that one cannot be saued, vnlesse he be in the visible Church, if so he can be, as commonly all Protestants do teach? Who contemne all ordinances of men as vnnecessary to saluation, why make they such account of this humane institution? At the last the Protestants haue felt this mischeife, as ye may see in Caluin in his 3. homily in his Opuscles pag. 548. and Danæus in his booke of the visible church, where they bring many reasons to proue, that it is necessary to be of the visible church. But seeing themselues do teach that the visible church is not the true Church in the sight of God, and consequently a humane institution, how can they proue, that God hath commaunded, or men can appoint so strictly to obserue this one humane Institution, vnder paine of damnation? Another inconuenience is, that Christs promises touching the continuance and mockery of Iewes and Infidels. For sith (as the Law sayth, and Protestants acknowledge) among men, there is no other account made of things that appeare not, then of things that are not; what man will reasonably perswade himselfe, that Christs Church hath euer continued in the world,

Absurdities follow of the inuisibility of the Church.

world, if she for many ages appeared in no one corner of the world? Surely this seemeth so incredible, that I think not, that any man well in his wittes believeth it, howsoeuer for to defend the Protestants Church he may say it. But farewell rather such a Church which cannot be defended but by such improbable paradoxes.

18. The 3. inconuenience is, that the church of God should haue byn much more miserable then hath byn the Synagogue of the Iewes, euen since it hath byn forsaken of God. For the Synagogue hath euer since Christs tyme byn visible vnto the world, and professed her fayth both before her owne and others. *The Iewish nation* (sayth S. Augustin) *whether vnder Pagan or Christian Kings, hath not lost the signe of her law, wherewith it is distinguished from other nations and people.* The same testifieth S. Hierome epist. 129. ad Dardan. And Peter Martyr in his Common places title of the Iewes §. 47: *The Hebrews, albeit subdued of the Romans, yet neuer tooke their lawes, rites and customes; they keep their own yet as well as they can.* And Sadeel in his Answere to Theses Posthan. cap. 8. graunteth the same. And the Magdeburgians in euery Century make speciall mention of the Iewes. To this some Protestants say, that it is no meruaile that the externall condition of the Church was more miserable thē of the Synagogue. But whosoeuer shall read the Propheties of the glory and amplitude of the Church, will think this strange. But besides, not only the externall, but also the internall state of the Church was more miserable then the Synagogue, if the Synagogue durst in all ages, euen before her enemies, professe her faith; and the Church of Christ for long tyme durst mutter nothing euen before her owne children, yea (as we shall hereafter

Lib. 11. cōt. Faust. c. 12.

Iunius & Damene l. 4. de Eccl. c. 50.

(as the Protestants teach) adored Antichrist, and obserued Antichristian and idolatricall rites & worships. The 4. inconuenience is, that if we say that the Church may be, and yet not be seene of any, we giue occasion to euery new start vp heretik, to say, that his church hath euer byn: neither can we refute this his dotage, vnlesse we do maintaine that the church must be euermore visible, & professe her fayth; which (as we haue seene) Protestants themselues do suppose, when they proue that any Church or company hath not byn in former tymes.

19. Out of all which hath byn sayd in this chapter, it appeareth euidently, that whither we put the forme of the Church in some visible thing or inuisible, whether we say that the only elect and iust be of the church or not they alone; of what kind soeuer (I say) the forme of the Church be, and whosoeuer be of the Church (of which matter I dispute not now) it is euident I say, that the Church of God neuer is at any tyme, but she professeth her fayth before her children and before the world; and consequently that the Church her profession of fayth, or (which comes all to one) that the Church according to her profession of fayth, is euermore visible, or sensible, which sufficeth to my purpose; because before Luther arose, there was no Church visible in profession of Protestant fayth. Wherefore I frame my 3. demonstration for to proue Luther to haue byn the Author of the Protestant Church in this sort: *Whensoeuer the Church is, she is visible in profession of her fayth:* (whether this profession be an essentiall forme, or a property or accident inseparable) *But the Protestant Church immediatly before Luther arose was not visible in profession of her fayth; Therefore immediatly before Luther she was not at*

all, and by his preaching became what Thase was he was the Author thereof. The Maior or first proposition of the Syllogisme is euident by all that hath byn sayd in this chapter. And the Minor or second proposition by all the verball Confessions which we haue rehersed in the former chapter, & by teall confessions of all Protestants whatsoeuer, who neither in Luthers tyme nor since, could bring forth any man worthy of credit, who had seene any company professing Protestiancy before Luther began to preach it. Then the which yet nothing had byn more easy to do, especially in Luthers tyme, if any such company had byn extant.

That Protestants confesse, that before Luther their Church had no Protestant Pastors.

CHAP. VII.

1. THE 4. demonstration for to proue that Luther was the Author of the Protestāt church and Religion, we will take out of that Protestants acknowledge their Church before his tyme to haue wholy wanted Pastors. First therefore they confesse, that their Pastors in former tymes were vnknowne to the world, and to Protestants themselues. D. Fulk in his booke of Succession pag. 26: *God hath raised vp Pastors in all ages, howsoeuer they were vnknowne to the world.* And pag. 22: *I deny* (sayth he) *this Succession* (of Pastors) *to be always notorious to the world.* And in his answere to Stapletons Cauillat: *who will acknowledge that the alone is the true Church, who can shew her Pastors in a continuall succession?*

Protestāts Pastors vnknown to the world.

sam Dr. Humfrey to 3. Reason of F. Campian p. 288. confesseth, that not so much as the names of the Pastors, who taught their Church, were extant. Dr Whitaker Cont. 2 quest. 5. cap. 6. page 408. thus writeth: *VVho then was the succession of our Pastors always visible? No. For this is not necessary. Though therefore our Pastors were not in times past manifest, neither can we name them, &c.* D. Morton in the first part of his Apology lib. 1. cap. 21. sayth, that *the Catholike church cannot always shew the nomination of Pastors.* D. White in his way to the church pag. 410: *I have shewed the teachers of our faith do lawfully succeed, and so alway have done, though not outwardly and visibly to the world.* The like he hath pag. 411. and 436. Sadel wrote his book de vocatione Ministrorum against such Protestants, as thought that their ministers wanted all lawfull calling, *because* (sayd they) *they have no perpetuall visible succession from the Apostles vnto these tymes.* And himselfe there pag. 560. confesseth, *that visible succession hath byn broken of, for many years in the church.* Thou seest (good reader) how they plainly confesse, that before Luther start vp, their Pastors were vnknowne to the world, not manifest, their succession not always visible, their names not extant, nor they can be named of Protestants. And indeed and effect they all confesse the same, when as none of them can produce any one man worthy of credit, who heard any Protestant preacher, who before Luther arose preached iustification by only fayth, and the other fundamentall points of Protestancy.

2. Secondly Luther either complaineth or boasteth for somtyme he alone preached Protestancy. In his Preface vpon his 1. tome: *As first I was alone.* And in his booke of the captiuity of Babylon tom. 2. fol. 631. *At that time I alone did rule the flame.* And against the

Luther alone.

the King of England fol. 497: *I alone stood in the battell, I alone was compelled to cast my selfe vpon the weapons of the Emperour and the Pope. I stood alone in danger forsaken of all, banished of men.* And vpon the graduall psalmes tom. 3. fol. 535: *In the beginning of my quarrell I took all the matter vpon my selfe, and did think that by Gods help I alone should sustain it.* And otherwhere, (as before is reported) he sayth, that without him others should not haue knowne one iot of the Ghospell. Melanchton in the Preface of the Acts of Ratisbon tom. 4. pag. 730 sayth: *Luther alone durst medle with the errors of the Popes & schoolers.* Zuinglius in his Exegesis to. 2. termeth Luther Ionathas, *who alone durst set vpon the campe of the Philistians.* And Caluin in his Admonition to Westphalus pag. 787. saith: *Luther alone doubted not to set vpon all Popery.* Besides, Luther (as before we haue rehearsed) writeth, that the only scripture was left, whereby men might recouer the sayth. But if at that tyme there had byn other Protestant Pastors, the scripture had not byn alone; and without Luther men might haue learnt the gospell. Neither had Luther byn left alone and forsaken of all, but some of them would haue stept out and seconded him especially after they saw that the preached without all danger.

The Protestant Ministery wholy perished.

3. Thirdly Protestants do sometyme plainly say, that their ministery was wholy perished before Luther arose. Luther in his booke of priuate Masse tom. 2. fol. 249: *Papists haue taken out of the Church the true Ministery of the word.* And of the Institution of Ministers fol. 372. he writeth, that Protestant ordination *was by Papists abolished and extinguished.* And vpon the graduall psalm. tom. 3. fol. 568: *The Church had no true Ministry vnder Antichrist.* Vpon the 25. of Genesis tom. 6. fol. 319: *In our tyme after those Popish monsters the true knowledge*

Taken away.

Abolished.

No true Ministery

ledge of the word, and of diuine ordination was extinguished.

And vpon the 49. chap. fol. 655: *We are not the church for any ordinary succession.* Caluin epist. 1002 *Because the true manner of ordination was broken off by the tyranny of the Pope, now we need haue new help to raise againe the Church.* And in Antwere to Sadolet pag. 132. he writeth, that *when the supremacy of the Pope was set vp, the true order of the Church perished.* And of true reformation p. 322: *Not without cause do we auouch the Church of God for some ages to haue lyn so long time and scattered, that it was destitute of true Pastors.* Beza in his Catechisme, title of the Church, cap. 5. sect. 18: *In our tyme it came to passe, things being so fallen downe, that there was left no place for ordinary vocation.* And epist. 5. pag. 39: *In our tyme ordinary vocation, which no where was, neither could, nor ought to be expected.* And Epist. 24: *It knowe, being taught by fresh examples, how the publike ministry being as it were ouerwhelmed for a tyme, yet the church of God remaineth.* And epist. 83: *The matter came to that passe, that the Ecclesiasticall order was wholy ouerthrowne euen to the foundation, the vaine names thereof only remayning.* And lib. de Notis Eccles. pag. 82: *They, who in our memory haue freed the church from the tyranny of Antichrist, had none of whome they might lawfully aske, or receiue imposition of hands.* And epist. 86: *It is manifest, that for some ages lawfull order was quite abolished in the Church: none, not so much as the slenderest shadow of the cheifest part of ecclesiasticall calling remayning.* The French Confession art. 31: *Sometymes, as in our age, the state of the Church being interrupted, it was needfull that some (Pastors) should be extraordinarily raysed of God.* Sadeel also de Vocat. Ministrorum p. 556. sayth, that *true Order (of Pastors) was interrupted.* D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 5. cap. 6. pag. 510: *We say, that our owne calling was not ordinary, but extraordinary, because ordinary calling was wholy corrupted.* Againe: *The state of the Church*

Extinguished.

Broke of.

Perished.

Destitute of Pastors

Ordinary vocation no where.

Ouerthrowne to the ground

Quite abolished.

Wholy corrupted

pag. 421: Finding no other kind of Pastors, sayth, that the Protestant Pastors were euen those, who lined in communion of the Roman, Greek, Armenian, and such like Churches; and addeth that his aduersary doth deceiue the reader when he intimateth, that Protestants goe about to shew any other kind of Pastors. Finally all those, who affirme that the vocation or Mission of Luther and their first Ministers was extraordinary, must needs say, that there were no former Protestant Pastours, of whome they could haue bin sent or approued.

Protestants say the Church may be without Pastors.

4. The same also they insinuate, when they teach, that the Church may be without Pastors; which they affirme, that thereby they may defend the being of their own Church before Luther, when it had no Pastors. Luther in cap. 4. Oseæ tom. 4. fol. 295: *As if the Church were tyed to any certaine order* (of Ministery) The Confession of Saxony cap. 12: *God doth sometimes reforme the Ministery.* Caluin of true Reform. pag. 332: *I graunt indeed that it can neuer fall out that the Church perish; but when they referre that to Pastors, which is promised of the perpetuall continuance of the church, to that they are much deceiued. For the Church doth not perish straight, if Pastors be wanting.* Beza of the notes of the Church pag. 55: *Ordinary succession and vocation of Pastors is not alwaies necessary or perpetuall.* Sudeel in Anti-Becanum pag. 533: *It is false, that the outward Ministery must be perpetuall.* The same he hath in Repetit. Sophism. Facultat.

pag.

[illegible] Dunchadius de Ecclesiast. cap. 3. num. 10. his [illegible] places de Eccles. quoth he, I answer that the true and visible succession of Bishops doth continue uninterrupted, the Church is extraordinarily assisted by God, as we were in the dayes of Eleutherius in his Theologicall Systeme lib. 1. pag. 397: The Church we [illegible] pleade for is that the order of succession (of Pastors) must be sometimes interrupted. And Veritius in his Antibellarm. pag. 148: The ordinary succession of the Church did sometimes interrupted sometimes. Ludbert in his 5. booke of the church cap. 9. We say that the Church may for a short space be deprived of Pastors. D. Whitaker &c. before cited, pag. 510: I gather that true and lawfull succession may be broken off, and that it is not a true, but only an accidentall note of the Church; because it pertaineth not to the essence of the Church, but only to her external state. And pag. 512: We say that ordinary succession hath sometimes been interrupted, and cut off in the true Church. D. Morton lib. 1. cap. 17. writeth thus: The matter of the proposition, to wit, where there is no succession there is no Church, we know to be weake. And cap. 18. he affirmeth this saying to be false: Succession of doctrine cannot be deduced from succession of persons. And cap. 23. layth: Succession of faith may be without succession of doctrine; and succession of doctrine without succession of persons. D. Fulke lib. de Succes. pag. 119: Yea even the very publike preaching of the word may be silent for a time; and the Church being deprived for a time of ordinary meanes of her salvation, may be preserved by the [illegible] of God. And D. White in his way to the Church pag. 87: all the externall government of the Church may come to decay, neither the [illegible] and personall succession of the Pastors may be [illegible]. And pag. 403: For the externall succession we care not, it is sufficient that in doctrine they succeeded the Apostles and primitive Churches, and to these [illegible] witnesses, which in all ages since have [illegible]

5. By the forelayd Confessions of Protestants it is most cleare, that when Luther began to play the Pastor, there was no Protestant preacher at all. For they acknowledge, that they are no Church for any ordinary succession; that the true order of the church perished, that the true Ministery was taken out of the Church, true knowledge of diuine ordination was extinguished, and ordination abolished and decayed: That the Church had no true Ministery, and that she was destitute of true Pastors. And that they meane these words both of a substantiall & vniuersall destruction of true Ministry, is manifest both by the selfe same words and others also. For they adde withall, that the state of the church was quite ouerthrowne, ordinary vocation wholy corrupted, that ordinary vocation was no where, no place left for ordinary vocation, and there were none, of whome those who freed their Church from Popery, might receiue imposition of hands: that the state of the Church was so interrupted, that God must raise vp Pastors extraordinarily, that the true ranck of ordination was so cut of, as that their needed a new succour and a new foundation; lastly that the Ecclesiastical order, the vaine names therof only remayning, was ouerthrowne from the foundation, and law full order quit abolished: that there was not left so much as the slenderest shadow of the cheifest parts of ecclesiasticall vocation. In which words either they say that there was neuer a Protestant Pastor at all, or that can be sayd by no words whatsoeuer. And such was the state and condition of the Protestant church, not for a small tyme, but as themselues say, for some ages. And for this cause vsually they call Luther & his first partners, their (a) first ministers, first (b) teachers, first (c) re-

(a) Plessis l. 2. de Eccl. c. 11. Napp. in 14. Apocal.
(b) Sadeel de Vocat. p. 47. 536.
(c) Gualt. Præfat. in epist. ad Rom.

lowers of the gospell, first (d) preachers of the gospell, first re-
formers of the house of God, Apostles and Euangelists.

(d) Perkin. Galat. cap. 1.

6. Finally I proue that there was no true Protestant preacher before Luther, out of the reall cõfession of all Protestants: For none of them all can by any sufficient testimony or argument proue, that there was any such Pastor. Wherefore this is rashly affirmed and fondly believed. *Either proue* (sayth Tertullian) *that which thou believest, or if thou prouest it not, how dost thou believe it?* And that common argument of theirs, wherewith they vse to proue, that they had a Church and Pastors at all tymes, because they bring the Scripture to proue their doctrine to be true; we shall hereafter shew to be a most vaine Sophisme. And besides themselues do ouerthrow it, in teaching as we haue seene, that the Church may be without Pastors; wherby it would not follow that they had Pastors, albeit they could by the Scripture proue that before Luther they had a Church. Moreouer when those who endeauour to name some Protestant preachers or Pastors before Luthers tyme, do plainly shew that there was no true and absolute Protestant Pastor, to wit such as taught iustification by only faith, and the rest of the fundamentall opinions of Protestancy. For the Apology of the Church of England pag. 103. sayth, *That they gaue not so cleare a light, but lighted as it were some sparck.* The Confession of Saxony cap. 12: *That they stayed stable vpon the foundation.* Cruciger and Rotarius in Luther tom. 1. fol. 202: *That they had some little light.* D. Fulke of Succeff. pag. 111: *That perhaps in all points they knew not the Apostolicall doctrine.* And D. Whitaker de Scriptura lib. 2. cap. 8. sect. vlt: *However they were entangled with most grosse darkenesse, yet they held some particles of truth, and showed them to others.* And

Lib. 5. cõt. Marc.

what other thing I pray you is this, but to confesse that such were but Protestants in part, and in some sort. Yea they name some, whome they confesse to haue reprehended only certaine abuses amongst the Papists, as Melancthon in his Answere to the Bauarian articles tom. 3. fol. 369. and Illyricus in his Catalogue lib. 15. confesse of Hilten. It remayneth yet for the accomplishing of this demonstration, that we also shew by the Confessions of Protestants, that the true Church of God can neuer want Pastors, as they haue confessed theirs to haue wanted for the space of some ages.

That the true Church cannot be without Pastors.

CHAP. VIII.

1. THAT the Church can neuer be without Pastors, I proue first out of the Confessions of the Protestant faith. For thus professe they to beleeue in the Confession of Saxony cap. 12: *The Sonne of God hath giuen ministers of the Ghospell vnto the Church, to the end it do not quite perish.* Againe: *He would haue alwayes a company in mankind, in which the Sonne himselfe appointed and conserued the Ministery of keeping and spreading his doctrine.* The Confession of Suitzers cap. 18: *God hath alwayes vsed ministers for to settle and gather him a Church, and also for to conserue and preserue it; and vseth the same now, and further will vse them whiles the Church shall be on earth.* The French Confession art. 25: *We beleeue the Church cannot consist if it haue not Pastors, who haue the office of teaching.* The Confession of the low Countries art. 30: *We beleeue that the*

true Church ought to be governed and ruled by that spirituall policy, which God hath taught in his word, so that there be Pastors and ministers in it. And the Confession of Strasburg: being the Church is the Kingdome of God, it hath diuers functions of ministers.

2. Secondly I proue it, because for the church to be without Pastors, is to want some part of the essence and definition given by the Protestants themselues. For Luther Propositon 15. to. 1. fol. 385. thus defineth a Church: *It is a number of baptized persons and beleeuers vnder one Pastor.* And tom. 2. fol. 366. he sayth: *The publike Ministery of the word dwelling by the Mysteries of God are dispensed, must be instituted by holy ordination, as the thing which in the Church is the chiefest and principallest of all.* Kemnice in his Common places title of the Church pag. 146: *The Church consisteth of Pastors and learners.* Gerlachius in his 22. Disput. pag. 966: *The Church is not a company meeting by chance or disordered, but called by the voice of the cryers of the word for to heare the doctrine of the Gospell.* Caluin 4. Institut. cap. 2. §. 7: *The Ministery is the chiefest knew and soule of the Church.* Beza of the Notes of the Church pag. 9: *By the name of the Church properly taken, it is certaine that not only Pastors but also flocks are vnderstood.* Iunius Cont. 5. lib. 1. cap. 15: *God instituted orders in the Church, for the essentiall outward constitution therof.* D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 5. cap. 6. pag. 508: *The Church cannot subsist without Pastors of whome it is taught. For doctrine doth make and constitute the Church, and is her soule and life.* And cap. 18. pag. 546: *The Church is no other number, then that which holdeth the pure preaching of the word and right vse of the Sacraments.* And cap. 17. pag. 541. 542: *Where preaching of the word and lawfull administration of the Sacraments do make the church; in so much as where soeuer they be, there the Church is; and where they be not, the Church is not.*

D. Feild in his 2. booke of the Church cap. 6. *The Ministery of Pastors and teachers is absolutely and essentially necessary to the being of the Church.* And lib. 1. cap. 10: *Bellarmine knoweth in reason we presume that there is and always hath been a visible Church, and that not consisting of some few scattered Christians without order of Ministry or use of Sacraments; for all this we do most willingly yield unto.* Yea the Philosophers by the light of reason perceived, that *it is impossible that there should be a Common wealth without Magistrates.* This same also is manifest by many other definitions which Protestants have made of the Church, and we have rehearsed them before, in which they place true preaching and administration as essentiall parts of the true Church; which yet cannot be without Pastors.

3. Besides, this were against the definitions of the Church given by the holy Fathers. For thus writeth S. Cyprian epist. 79: *The Church is the people united to the Priest, and the flock cleaving to the Pastor.* And this he proveth out of those words of our Saviour Matth. 16: *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church.* S. Hierome also in his dialogues against the Luciferians: *It is no Church which hath no Priest.* S. Ignatius in his epist. ad Trallianos: *Without these (Priests) the elect Church is not, no congregation without these, no meeting of Saints.* And whereas Danæus lib. 4. de Eccl. cap. 1. sayth, that these Fathers define only a visible church, that availeth nothing: because indeed there is no Church on earth which is not visible in profession of faith. Againe, Pastors shall be at least of the essence of the visible Church, and consequently the Protestant Church, which before Luther wanted Pastors, was no visible Church. Furthermore, S. Cyprian proveth his definition out of those words of Christ

Matt.

Matt. 16. which (as is certaine and Protestants confesse) are spoken of the true Church in the sight of God. And S. Ignatius sayth, that there is no elect church, no congregation of Saints, without Priests: which he must needs meane of the true Church. And Saint Hierome simply sayth it is no Church, which hath no Priests: which he could no way say, if the true Church in the sight of God could be without Priests. And hereby also is refuted Sadeel in Repetit. Sophism. Turriani pag. 652. when he sayth: *The definition of S. Cyprian is not essentiall, nor properly teacheth what the Church is, but what it one is ought to be.* For S. Cyprian inferreth out of his definition, that if one be not with the Bishop he is not in the Church. And Saint Hierome pronounceth one Hilarius sect to have perished with him, because he left no Pastor behind him. And for this cause the Fathers do still object vnto heretiks the want of succession of Pastors, as an evident marke that they are not the Church (as even Protestants themselves confesse. For thus writeth D. Whitaker Contr. 1. quest. 5. cap. 6. pag. 509: *The Fathers rebuked heretiks that they wanted succession of Bishops.* Sadeel of Vocation of Ministers pag. 546: *S. Augustin often times opposed this succession against the Manichees and Donatists.* Zanchius of the Church pag. 138: *I admit that succession of true Bishops is a marke of the Church; and of this speake the Fathers.* The like confesse Caluin Respons. ad Versipellem pag. 358. and 4. Institut. cap. 2. §. 3. Beza epist. 3. Plessy de Eccles. cap. 3. Fulke de Succes. pag. 36. D. Morton Apol. part. 1. lib. 1. cap. 13. Iames Andrewes cont. Hosium pag. 89. and others. Neither is it true which D. Whitaker and Sadeel say, that the Fathers did not think that they convinced the Heretiks not to be the Church, because they wanted succession of

Pastors. For S. Irenæus saith they hereby he could soundeth heresie, and that this is a most sufficient confutation. S. Augustine writeth, that this argument of succession held him in the Church. S. Athanasius calleth it a notable and admirable argument. And Basile himselfe doth expressly say, that with this weapon S. Cyprian did especially vanquish the Novatians. And Peter Martyr in his Common places tit. de Schismate, writeth that S. Augustines argument taken from the succession of Pastors was very evident against the Donatists.

Protestats confesse necessity of Pastors

I thinke I have proved that the Church cannot be without Pastors, because otherwise the Protestats confesse. Luther vpon the 1. chap. of Genesis tom. 6. fol. 129. *The Church cannot consist without continuall vse of the word.* And of the Nobles of the Church tom. 7. fol. 191. *The Church cannot be without Pastors.* Melancthon vpon the 3. cap. of Matth. tom. 1. fol. 392. *God will always haue some publike Ministery. He will not suffer the publike ministery to be destroyed.* And in cap. 16. pag. 418. *There is no Church where there is no Ministery.* And in his 6. sermon vpon the rock pag. 470. *The Church is built vpon the Ministery.* And tom. 1. in loc. cap. de Eccles. fol. 227. *We must not feigne a Church without the Ministery.* And cap. de numero Sacramentorum fol. 342. *The Ministery cannot be quite destroyed.* And in his disputs of Ecclesiast. policy tom. 1. Lutheri fol. 442. *The Church cannot exist, the ministery being extinguished.* Kemnitius in his Common places tit. of the Church cap. 4. *There are promises touching the perpetuall conseruation of the Ministery in the Church.* Gerselonius Disput. 22. pag. 940. *The publike Ministery is always conserued.* Master Andrewes against Hosius pag. 336. *No man denieth that the Church cannot be without Bishops.* Oecolampadius vpon the 62. cap. of Isaias pag. 203. *Confesseth vp and downe his Epistles and preachers.* Bolsec

will in his Synagogue lib. 7. cap. 11. The function of ordinary Ministers after the Ecclesiastical order is necessarie, perpetuall, and to endure to the end of the world. Calvin 4. Instit. cap. 2. §. 4: For as the light and heat of the Sunne, nor meat and drinke, are so necessary to cherish and sustaine the present life, as the Pastorall function is for to conserve the church on earth. And §. 3: God hath settled forever the way of governing and holding his Church by Ministers. And §. 4: The church can never want Pastors and teachers. Beza de Notis Eccles. pag. 60: The church can never want either the seed of the word, or sowing, or sowers. Vorstius in Antibellarm. pag. 197: The Gomarists acknowledge the 2 other orders to be perpetuall in the Church, to wit, Pastors, Priests, and Deacons. D. Whitaker tom. 2. quest. 3. cap. 2. pag. 469: I answere that there were alwayes Pastors and sheepe, and that there shall be still Pastors to the end of the world. And quest. 3. cap. 6. pag. 508: I confesse the succession of Pastors to be necessary. Againe: I answere that the Church cannot stand without Pastors. D. Fulke de Sweet. pag. 227: I grant that the succession of Pastors is necessary in the church. And pag. 93: The pure doctrine of Christ and the apostles we can want no more then pure waters. D. White in defence of his way cap. 35. pag. 381: The Church shall never want Pastors. And his Majesty in his Monarchy epistle pag. 61: Neither can hell stand without some order and distinction. The Divels are devided into Legions and have their Princes, how then can any commonwealth on earth stand and which is confused and disordered without all manner of orders or degrees? You see how confused a thing Protestants account the Church to be without Pastors; and that they speake for other will of the Church, when they consider the ordering thereof, then when they looke upon the condition of their owne Church in former tymes before Luther. Neither do they only some tymes confesse that the Church cannot be without Pastors, but also acknowe-

Scripture requireth Pastors.

acknowledge that Scripture do teach so. For thus Melanchthon in his forecited disputation fol. 483: *Where the Church is, there must needs be lawfull ordination of Ministers; which ordination is one of the proper gifts of the Church, according to that of the 4. chap. to the Ephesians: He hath given Pastors &c.* Kemnitius in the 2. part of his examen tit. de Sacramento ordinis pag. 192: *The Sonne of God himselfe will conserue in the Church with perpetuall calling the Ministry of those who teach the Ghospell, so sayth Paul Ephes. 4.* Calvin. 4. Institut. cap. 3. §. 2: *In these words (Ephes. 4.) he sheweth the Ministry to be the cheife sinew, wherewith the faythfull hang together in one body, and insinuateth also that the Church cannot otherwise be safe, vnlesse it be propped with these helpes, in which God would place her safety.* The like he hath in cap. 4. Ephes. and 1. Cor. cap. 6. and 12. and 1. Tim. cap. 3. D. Whitaker Cont. 2. queſt. 5. cap. 19. pag. 549: *The place of Esay cap. 59: My spirit &c. sheweth that the true preaching of the word shall be perpetuall in the Church.* D. Whitgift in his Answere to the Admonition pag. 171: *The place of Mathew 9. sheweth that Ministers are necessary in the Church.* D. Fulk ad Cauillat. 8. rapl: *You do that which is done already, whiles you proue out of the Apostles writings that the continuance of the Pastors and Doctors is of no lesse certainty, then the continuance of sayth and doctrine.* And de Succeſſ. pag. 180: *The Scriptures promise perpetuall succession of Pastors and Doctors.*

Preaching necessary to sayth.

5. Fourthly I proue this same because Protestants sometymes do teach, that preaching (which cannot be done without Pastors) is necessary to ingraft sayth in men. For, as before we rehearsed, they condemne the Anabaptists and Suenckfeldians in that they teach, that men can come to sayth without preaching. And Luther tom. 1. fol. 54. writeth that the administration of the word by a Priest is needfull

needfull for faith. And Coot. Caterin. tom. 1. fol. 140. layth, that by the vocall word the Church is conceiued, formed, nourished, begotten, and conserued. And de institvendis Ministris fol. 372: *Seing the church is brought forth, nourished, and conserued by the word of God, it is manifest that she cannot be without the word; or if it be without the word, that is leaueth to be a Church.* In cap. 17. Ioannis tom. 5. fol. 203: *For God hath not determined to conserue them* (the fayth full) *without outward meanes, albeit he could do it.* Also vpon the 1. chap. of Zacharias: *Although God can teach men the Ghospell without sermons, yet he will not do it.* And of the Notes of the church tom. 7. fol. 149: *What could or would the people of God beleiue, vnlesse the word of God founded there.* Melanchton in locis tom. 3. cap. de libero arb. fol. 311: *God gathereth a true Church by the voice of the Ghospell and not otherwise.* Kemnice in the 2. part of his examen tit. de Sacramento ordinis pag. 391: *God by his certaine counsell hath determined, that he will dispense those things, which belong to the matter of our saluation, not immediatly by infusing new and peculiar reuelations into the minds of men without any meanes, but by the outward Ministry of the word.* Caluin. 4 Institut. cap. 1. §. 5: *Howbeit Gods power be not tyed to outward meanes, neuerthelesse he hath tyed vs to the ordinary meanes of Preaching. Many are puffed vp by pride, disdaine and emulation to perswade themselues that they can profit inough by priuate reading and meditating.* And §. 4: *The knowledge of her* (the visible Church) *is profitable to vs, yea necessary, for we cannot come to life vnlesse she conceiue vs in her wombe, beare vs, nourish vs with her dugs.* And in 1. Tim. cap. 3: *The office of preaching which God hath left in his church, is the only instrument of truth, that is to put out of mens minds. The Ministery of the word being taken away God truth will fall downe.* Beza epist. 20: *It is cleare that fayth cometh of hearing, and therefore preaching must goe before fayth.* Taye in his

his Enchiridion disput. 60: *The necessity of ecclesiastical Ministry appeareth in that without it we can not know the word of God, nor his will therein revealed vnto vs.* D. Whitaker lib. 1. de Scriptura cap. 9. sect. 9. pag. 106: *The ministry being taken away, neither fayth, nor Charity, nor obedience, nor any vertue will remayne safe.* And cap. 2. sect. 6. pag. 37: *We cannot at all believe without the Ministry of the church.* And lib. 3. cap. 15. sect. 20. pag. 478: *I affirme, determine, and hold, that there is no entrance to salvation without the Ministry of the word.* Againe: *by the Ministry of Pastors we believe the Scripture, neither is it to be hoped that without the Ministry fayth can grow in our minds.* And cap. 5. sect. 2: *I confesse the Ministry of the Church to be most necessary.* And Cont. 2. quest. 5. cap. 19. pag. 550: *We never come to fayth without preaching of the word.* D. Fulke de Succes. pag. 30: *The peoples salvation cannot be procured without preaching.* And pag. 161: *No Christian will deny preaching of the word to be necessary for the edification of the church.* M. Latimer in his sermons fol. 38: *Take away preaching and take away salvation.* Fol. 99: *The office of preaching is the only ordinary meane, whereby God hath determined to save vs.* M. Cartwright in M. Hooker lib. 5. of Ecclesiasticall policy p. 41: *Reading may set forward, but not begin the worke of salvation, fayth may be nourished therewith, but not bred; therein hath attention to the Scriptures and their speculation of the creatures of God like efficacy, both being of power to augment, but neither to effect beliefe without sermons.* And the Puritans in D. Whitgifts Answere to the Admonitions: *Reading is no feeding.* How then could there be any Protestant Church or fayth at all before Luther, when (as we heard before) there was then no Protestant preacher? And in like sort sometymes they confesse, that the Scripture it selfe teacheth, that preaching is necessary to have fayth. The Confession of Ausburg cap.

Scripture requireth preaching

cap. de potest. Eccles. pag. 59: *Euerlasting iustice, the holy Ghost, eternall life, cannot be had but by the ministry of the word and Sacraments, as Paul sayth.* The Confession of Bohemia art. 10: *They graunt that none can attaine to right sayth, vnlesse he heare the word of God, according to that of S. Paul, Sayth is of hearing.* And againe: *How shall they believe in him of whome they haue not heard.* And the Protestants in their conference at Marspurg agreed, as reporteth Hospinian part. 2. Histor. fol 77: *That the holy Ghost, if we speake of the ordinary course, giueth sayth to none, vnlesse preaching or the vocall word goe before; but by and with the vocall word he worketh and maketh sayth, where and in whome it pleaseth him,* Rom 10. Caluin also 4. Institut. cap. 1. §. 5: *God inspireth sayth into vs by the instrument of his Ghospell, as Paul admonisheth, that sayth is of hearing.* Againe: *We must hold that which I haue set downe out of Paul, that the Church is not otherwise edified but by outward preaching.* and in 1. Tim. cap. 3: *Paul meaneth simply that which in other words he deliuereth Rom. 10. because sayth is of hearing, that there will be no sayth vnlesse there be preaching.* The like he hath 1. Cor. 3. v. 6. Heb. 4. v. 12. and Ephes. 4. v. 12. Beza in the Conference at Montbelgard pag. 407: *The ordinary manner whereby sayth is infused, is by hearing the word,* Rom. 10. And Bucer in cap. 10. Rom: *The Apostle knew that God could call men without the ministry of men, neuerthelesse he absolutely wrote: How shall they believe in him of whome they haue not heard.* Hyperius also vpon the same place: *That is, that all believe and call vpon God, it is needfull that before they heare the Ghospell and be taught.* D. Whitaker lib. 1. de Script. cap. 2. sect. 4: *That of the Apostle, how shall they believe without a preacher, conuinceth thus much, that preaching is necessary to conceiue assured of sayth God.* And c. 10. sect. 4: *The Apostle doth plainly say, that sayth is of hearing.* And Cont. 2. quest. 5. c. 19. pag. 549: *This place (Esay 59. 5*

sheweth

shewth that true preaching of the word shall be perpetuall in the Church. M. Perkins in his exposition of the Creed col. 787: I answere that place Rom. 10. Faith is of hearing, to be understood of sufficient faith. So that neither the visible nor inuisible Church could ever haue byn without preaching.

6. Out of all that hath byn sayd in this and the former chapter I thus make my fourth demonstration, for to prove that Luther was Author of the Protestant Church. *If before Luther the Protestant Church had no Pastors, she was not then at all: But then she had no Pastors at all: Therefore then she was not at all: And by him she came to haue both Protestant Pastors and sheep: Therefore by him she had her beginning.* The Maior is euident by those Confessions of Protestants which we haue rehearsed in this chapter; and the Minor by those that were repeated in the former.

That the Protestants Church and Religion before Luther was no where.

CHAP. IX.

1. THis first demonstration, for to prove that Luther was Author of the Protestat church and Religion, shall be taken from want of place; to wit, that it was no where before Luther began. And this I proue, first, because they oftentymes say, that before Luthers tyme their Church was in the desert, in darknes, in lurking holes, in Trephonius denne, neuertheles they tell not where this desert, this darknes, this lurking hole, this denne was. Secondly some of them confesse, that they know not where their

Protestats name not the place.

their Church was in tymes past. D. Whitaker Controuersie 3. cap. 3. pag. 475. They are angry with vs that know not (we cannot shew, and in set words point out) the place, where our Church was in tymes past. The same inuenteth Sadeel ad Repetit. Sophism. Forriani pag. 766. saying, that he answered this question, *Where there Church lurked*, when he sayd, *That it lay hidde by the vnsearcheable iudgement of God*; as if he sayde: It lay so close hid, that it cannot be knowne where it lay. Also D. Hall in his Rome Irreconcilable sect. 1. when he calleth this our demaund, *Where their Church lurked*, an idle demaund of Pettifoggers. But that it is no idle demaund, is manifest. For first, what man in his wittes seeth not, that she, who is pretended to be the Catholike Church, that is, spred ouer the world, was not at all, if no place can be found where she was for many ages. Againe, because the holy Fathers and Protestants themselues demaund this of heretikes. *Where are yee* (sayth Tertullian) *when, and whence came ye? where lurked ye so long?* Againe: *Let them bring forth the offspring of their Churches.* S. Athanasius: *Whence came these things? yea what hell hath vomited them out?* And S. Augustine: *Where appeared Donatus? Out of what ground sprung he? Out of what sea arose he? from what heauen fell he?* And Beza epist. 18. demaundeth the like of the Arians saying: *If their opinion be true, we bid them shew vs where was their Church.* Besides, the Confession of Saxony chapp. of the Church, professeth, that *the true Church knoweth where she is.* And Kemnitz in his Common places Tit. de Eccles. ca. p. 3: *God will haue vs to know which, and where is the true Church.* Wherefore it is no idle but a most necessary thing, to know where the Church is: and if Protestants immediatly before Luther arose, knew not where the Church was; it must needs follow that

Praef. 32.

Lib. de Nicen. Synod.

& de Syn. Seleuc.

Lib. 3. de Bapt. c. 2.

that she was not the true Church.

Catholiks alwayes asked where was the protestant Church.

2. Thirdly I proue it, because euen those who take vpon them to tell where their Church was in former tymes, do shew indeed, that they know no place where she was. For as M. Iewel sayth art. 1. diuis. 7. pag. 10. *Eckius, Pighius, Hosius and others haue often cryed out a mayne in their bookes and pulpits, where was your religion before Luther first began to preach?* And that the same hath byn demaunded by Catholiks, confesseth Peter Martyr in locis tit. de discessu ab Eccl. Rom. col. 1492. Beza de Notis Eccles. pag. 78. and in his 13. question. D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 3. cap. 3. M. Perkins in his Reformed Catholik tract. 22. cap. 1. and others. And it is manifest by the writings & speeches of all Catholikes. Yea Luther in cap. 19. Isaiæ tom. 4. fol. 125. writeth, that this was our first argument against them, and will be our last: *Art thou alone wise, or doest thou thinke that all our auncestours saw nothing? Did all those, whowere before thee, erre?* Because he saw, that this argument did most presse him, and that he could neuer answere it. Let vs see therefore, what they answere to this our first and last demaund so often and with such earnestnesse and so great cryes proposed of vs. D. Whitaker cont. 2. quest. 3. cap. 2. proposeth their answere in these words: *Stapleton sayth, that Caluin and we say, that the true Church was in Popery, but that Popery was not the church. That indeed we all say.* And the same in substance answereth Luther lib. de seru. arbit. tom. 2. fol. 438. in psal. mos graduales to. 3. fol. 589. And de Missa priuata tom. 7. fol. 236. Iames Andrewes cont. Bellarm. pag. 326. Bertrand in Compend. Theol. Hist. de Eccl. pag. 582. Hunnius Praxeos tract. de Iustific. Heberus in Antibellar. in lib. 4. cap. 2. Hutter in Aug. Confess. Augustin. p. 447. Gerlachius disput. 22. p. 791.

Protestants answere.

Lobechius

Lobethius disp. 1. pag. 102. Gesnerus loc. 22. Reinecc. lib. 4. armat. in cap. 3. And amongst the Sacramentaries Calvin 4. Instit. cap. 2. §. 12. Peter Martyr, Beza, and M. Perkins loco cit. Sedes in Refut. Thes. Posnan. cap. 8. Polanus part. 3. Thes. de Eccl. Daneus de Antichristo cap. 16. Junius lib. 4. de Eccl. cap. 166. Vorstius in Catechism. quest. 54. art. 2. Sohnius in method. Theol. pag. 213. Bucanus loc. 4. de Eccl. and others commonly.

3. But this answer satisfieth not our question, for many causes. First, because to say, that the Church was in Popery, but Popery was not the Church, doth not seeme an answere, but a ridle, & perhaps put of purpose, because as Bucer sayth: *Protestants mysteries must not be expounded to Papists.* Secondly they agree not among themselves what they meane by Popery. For Boyseul in his Cōfutation of Spondé pag. 715. will have it to be Popish doctrine, saying: *He knoweth not what we call Popery. He imagineth, that it is men. But we say, that it is all heresies and errors, the sinnes & idolatries of the Roman Church.* And D. White in defence of his way cap. 31. pag. 305: *The Papacy is nothing else but a disease or excrement breeding in the Church.* Moulins of Arnolds Eighes cap. 61. *Popery is a masse of errors, and corruptions of Christianity.* And Calvin in 1. Galat. v. 9: *Popery is a horrible monstrous of the Gospell.* Others by Popery understand the company of Papists. Schusselburg tom. 8. Catal. haeret. pag. 480. writeth that Popery signifieth a company. And Iames Andrewes Cont. Hosium pag. 326. sayth: *Popery, that is, the Pope, Bishops and they who conform to their impiety.* Thirdly Popery whereby you understand such a company, as such doctrine, is no place; & we aske for the place wherein Protestants were before Luthers tyme. Fourthly,

Lib. 1. epist. Eccles.

because we aske not whether only they say their church was, (for what can they not say?) but where they proue their Church to haue byn. Wherefore that I may imitate S. Augustines words, I demaund whither God told them that their Church was in tymes past in Popery, or man? If God, let them read it out of the Scripture. If man, let them bring him forth that we may iudge, whither he be worthy to be believed or no. If neither God nor man told them this, then it is, (as the Scripture speaketh) an vnlearned fable, which cannot be proued by any diuine or humane testimony, a fiction, a dreame, which they would be ashamed to vtter, if they were not compelled by necessity to say somewhat. But (as S. Hilary sayth) *he is not ashamed of folly, who hath lost religion*. Fiftly I proue this, because Protestants euen by their manner of speach do bewray, that they are not certaine that their Church was in Popery. For D. White in his Way cap. 33. pag. 338. sayth: *It is more then probable*. Ossiander in his Manuel englished pag. 65. sayth: *It is Credible*. Gerlachius tom. 2. disput. 22. sayth: *How many shall we think there were*. Others confesse, that they know not those Protestants whome they say to haue byn in Popery. Luther in psalm. 45. tom. 3. fol. 447: *Vnder Popery there were alwayes and yet are some believers, whome we know not*. D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 3. cap. 3. pag. 476: *We say there were in tymes past many thousands of men in Popery, who professed our fayth and adored not the beast; whome albeit we cannot name, yet God knew*. Besides, some of them say, that there was no face or shew of their Church in Popery. D. Whitaker loc. cit. p. 477: *We say, that there were so few good in Popery, as they appeared not*. And Cont. 4. quest. 5. cap. 3. pag. 582: *We surely say, that in tymes past the Church lay hid in Popery*. And I set her

Lib. 1. cōt. Gaud. c. 13.

2. Pet. 1.

Lib. 7. de Trinit.

Know not.

Can not name.

Appeared not.

vpon

vpon the 90. psalm. fol. 495: *The Church was in Popery, but truly so hidden, as to him, that we could iudge of the outward appearance, it might seeme to be no where.* Caluin also 4. Instit. cap. 2. §. 12. speaketh in this sort of his Protestants, whom he imagined in Popery: *In whom all things are so out of order, as there may rather seeme the face of Babilon then of the citty of God.* By what appearance then iudge they, when they say that their Church was in Popery?

4. Sixtly, I proue that the Protestant church was not in Popery, by the Persons whom they challenge. Luther tom. 1. Caterin. tom. 2. fol. 140. writeth thus: *Where ye see no ghospell, as we see now in the Synagogue of the Papists, there doubtles is no Church, vnlesse you except infants and simple soules.* And fol. 195: *whome in all the world hath not the Pope seduced, except perhaps infants and silly persons, saued by an vnknowne Counsaile.* M. Bale Cent. 1. cap. 74. writeth, that their Church since Phocas the Emperours tyme, *Was in lurking holes and amongst idiots.* Gretzchius disput. 21. sayth that Infants *were no small part of their Church.* Osiander loc. cit. pag. 65. that they *were a great part.* And as Lobechius addeth disput. 10. pag. 201: *The noblest part.* A worthy Church vndoubtedly, which for many ages consisted of infants, idiots, and such silly persons. And they more silly who giue credit to so silly an affirmation of Protestants without all proofe; and they most silly of all who relinquishing the Catholike Church, adioyne themselues to such a childish and silly Church, so sillily affirmed and without proofe. Seauenthly Protestants themselues do plainly professe that the entire substance and essence of their Church was not in Popery, but only some part thereof. And we, (as hath byn often said) speake not of a Church in part, or in some sort, but of a

What kind of Persons they challenge.

Infants & silly ones.

Idiots.

The whole essence of a Protestit Church not in Popery.

of a Church which hath all the essentiall and substantiall parties, and may be simply and absolutely tearmed a Church. Calvin 4. Instrupt. cap. 2. after he had sayd 4. 1. that it is certaine there is no Church where lyes and falsity haue gotten the vpper hand; in straight sayth 4. 2: *Being matters so vnder Popery, We may gather how much of the Church remayneth there.* And addeth; *that vnder Popery. That doctrine without which Christianity standeth not, is all buryed and thrust out.* And Respons. ad Sadolet. pag. 128. writeth: *That in Popery there appeareth scarce any scattered and torne remnants of the church.*

Scarse any remnants.

Peter Martyr in locis tit. de discessu a Rom. Eccl. col. 1493: *Now there are left among Papists only some rubbish and pieces of old walles, together &c.*

Only rubbish.

Sonis. Resp. ad Spondeum cap. 2. pag. 32: *Antichrist hath left nothing in all his building, but some old wals.*

But old wals.

Sadeel Praefat. lib. de Verbo scripto: *The Romane Church is so depraued and corrupted, that whiles we seeke the Church, in the church; we are forced to behold only ashes of the Church.* The Apology of the Church of England part. 4. cap. 9. diuis. 5: *The Iewes now haue left nothing remayning in the Church of God that had any likenesse of his Church.* And part. 6. cap. 17. diuis. 1: *When we saw that nothing remayned in the temple of God but pitifull ruine and decayes, we &c.* Finally Luther in Psalm. 22. tom. 3. fol. 132. sayth, that in Popery *there was no trace of the Church.* And in psalm. 17. fol. 285: *They haue brought matters to such passe, that where the Church of God was heretofore, there is nought but beastonish superstition and the name only of the church remayning; the substance is quite lost.* The same also meane those, who say that in Popery were some small footsteps, some reliques, and parcels of the church, albeit they had not this exclusiue terme, Only. But if in Popery the doctrine without which Christianity cannot stand were wholy buryed and

Only ashes.

Nought but ruins.

No trace.

Name only.

out; If therein (worse appeared some parcells of the Church, only ashes thereof were seene; If nothing remayned but old walls, rubbish and ruines; nothing entire and like to a Church; and the name only remayning, the substance were quite lost, doubtles there was no absolute and true Protestant Church in Popery, but only in part and in some sort. Which Danæus plainly intimateth when he saith Cont. 4. lib. 3. cap. 13. pag. 387: *Some footsteps of the Church remayne yet in that* (Popish) *company, as if the ruines of a house cast downe and the bare walls were called a house equivocally.* Or as Caluin speaketh Respons. ad Versipellem pag. 357: *In some part the Protestant Church was heretofore in Popery.*

5. That I may therefore gather together all that Protestants say of their Church in Popery before Luthers tyme; Concerning the persons whereof it consisted, they were infants, idiots, silly ones; and perhaps not they neither; Concerning the substance, it was only ruines, rubbish, old walles, ashes, and name only of the Church. Concerning the number, it was (a) *Very small; fewder reliques, few remnants, and scarce a few reliques, so small reliques, one or two persons.* Touching the place wherein she was, that was lurking holes, or rather none at all. For so sayth D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quæst. 5. cap. 2. pag. 468: *The holy and pious men were together with their Pastors dispersed into this or that place without any certaine abode or Succession.* And quæst. 5. cap. 4. pag. 505: *Our men were in times past scattered here and there.* Touching the state of their Church, that was (b) quite fallen downe. Touching the face of shew thereof, that was rather of Babylon then of the Church. As for the Condition, it was afflicted of Antichrist, with fraudge domination, warrs [illegible]

(a) Luther in psalm. 82. f. 368 de Missa fol. 7. fol. 230. Gerlac. disput. 22. Acontius l. 2. Satan. Pet. Soto ad Sophist. pag. 590. ad Thes. Pos. non. 18.

(b) Hp. c. 2.

bly brought to naught, and all her affaires most desperat. For profession of fayth, she made none at all. For externall rites and worship, she was compelled to keep very Babylonicall, heathenish, idolatricall, and Antichristian rites. For piety, that was all driue out. Touching fayth, that was quite extinct. As for her Conseruation, that was by meruailous and miraculous meanes, & by meere miracle. And lastly for the testimonies whereby either her being, are any of these points are proued, they are pure Pythagoricall, that is, their owne words, which is (as themselues say) arguments of fooles, or rather lyes, for who so speaketh of himselfe speaketh lyes.

6. My eighth reason is, because Protestants should haue sayd that their Church had bene in any company rather then in Popery. For Luther lib. cōt. Regem Angliæ tom. 2. fol. 334. writeth, that Popery *is the most pestilent abomination of Satan, which hath lyn, or hereafter shall be vnder heauen.* And in cap. 15. Genes. tom. 6. fol. 342: *Popery is a Congregation of diuels, and of most wicked men.* And lib. cont. Papatum tom 7. fol. 479. saith: *It is the last mischeife of the world, and to which all the Diuell with all their cunning & power cannot bring a greater.* Others say that Popery is *the body of Satan and Antichrist, the dungeon of errors & heresies, that it is worse then any sect of heretikes, yea then Paganisme, or Turcisme;* And almost all of them cry that it is the Synagogue of Satan and Antichrist. Moreouer Luther in Actis exustionis decretalium tom. 2. fol. 123. pronounceth, *that it were safer liuing in the wildernes, to see no man, then to conuerse in the Popish Kingdome.* And in cap. 2. Galat. tom. 5. fol. 127: *Whosoeuer is earnestly affected towards Godlines, let him tremble at the name of Popery.* And Protestants commonly gather out of that saying of the Apocalips: *Goe out my people, that it*

Caluin ad V. Sept. pag. 360. V. Whitak. cont. 2. q 6 c. 1. Ochin. dial. 25. Horne of the supr. p. 301.

the

the commaundement of God, that all pious men should goe out of Popery. If then Popery be the Synagogue of Satan and Antichrist, & worse then any heretical, Turkish, or heathenish company, or any other, whom all the diuels which all their cunning could raise; If all pious men ought to tremble at the hearing of the name thereof, and rather liue in a desert then therein; If finally it be the Commandemet of God, that all godly men should goe forth of Popery, how came it to passe, that in former tymes the godly (forsooth) Protestants lined in Popery, and in Popery alone, & that for so many ages? Would godly men abid in that company, and only in that company, and so long tyme, which was the worst that could be, before which they shold haue preferred the wildernes, haue shaken at the name thereof, & were commanded to come out from thence by Gods expresse commandement? Surely the Protestants must not only haue byn children and simple, but also impious and vngodly. What! could not, or would not the spouse of Christ lurke for so many ages, but in the stewes of the diuell? Could Christ be no where, but with Antichrist? Would only Antichrist for so many ages affoard Christ and his church a harbour or lurking place? *O straights* (sayth S. Austine) *O incredible absurdities!* For what greater straights, what more incredible absurdity can there be, thē to thrust Christ and his Church into the diuels stewes, and that for many ages togeather? But as Caluin himself sayth: *There is no meruaile if these reprobate spirits, as if they were frantique, do thrust in most grosse absurdities for to defend their errors, for God iustly punisheth their pride and obstinacy which such giddinesse.* l. 2. de mor. Manich. c. 4. 4. Instit. c. 10. §. 30.

7. Ninthly, I argue, and aske what is the meaning

meaning of the foresayd riddle: *The Church was in Popery but Popery was not the Church.* First, I suppose that by Popery heere, they meane not (as did Boyssrul) popish doctrine; as if the sense were, that the Protestant Church consisted of Popish doctrine, as we say that the Popish Church consisteth (to wit formally) of Popish doctrine; the Iewish Church of Iudaisme, & the Turkish of Turcisme; because this sense were too far from the question, which demaundeth the place, and not the forme, or doctrine of the Protestant church in former tyms. Besides, it were too too absurd to say that the Protestant Church consisteth in the contrary doctrine, which he condemneth. Supposing therfore, that hereby Popery they vnderstand the company of Papists, their meaning cannot be, that their Church was in the company of Papists, as in a multitude of men amongst whom they liued only, but did no way participate of their doctrine or worship; both because in this manner, it had byn knowne to Papists, which notwithstanding they deny, as before we shewed, and anone shalbe proued to be false; as also because in this sort their Church may be sayd to be in Iudaisme, Turcisme, & the like, if they liue among Iewes or Turcks; which is so absurd as Protestats deny their meaning to be such. For thus Beza epist. 10. quest. 4: *The Church was in Popery, which can no way be sayd of the Turks.* And M. Perkins lib. cit. after he sayd that the Church was long tyme in Popery, addeth, *Which cannot be likewise sayd of Turks and other Infidels, that the Church was conserued, or that yet any hidden Church is conserued among them.* Neither can their meaning be, that the Protestant church was in tyms past in Popery, as a part in the whole, to wit, because it consisted of some that beleeued both Protestancy

and

and Popery, or if they did not believe Popery, yet they professed it; because after this manner Popery should no lesse haue byn the Church, the Church should haue byn in Popery. For as the church should haue byn in Popery, because it consisted of such a part of Popery; so Popery should haue byn the church because such a part of Popery had byn the Church. Besides, it implieth contradiction, that one should believe both Popery and Protestancy, which as Protestants say, are right opposite in many fundamental points. If any reply, that those Papists in whom the Protestant Church of old tyme did consist, did not believe all fundamentall points of Popery, nor were absolutely Papists, but only in part and in some sort: first he mocketh the Reader in saying absolutely, that the Protestant church was in Popery, because Popery absolutely taken, doth signify absolute Papist or Papistry. Besides he feigneth and deuiseth those Papists in part & in some sort, and cannot proue by any sufficient testimony that there were any such; Whereas according to S. Augustin, *He must proue, not speake at random*. Nor can he say, that the Protestant Church consisted of such, & tho though they believed little or no Papistry at all, yet outwardly professed it. For if outwardly they professed only Papistry, how know you that inwardly they believed Protestancy? Will you, as S. Augustin sayd to the Donatists, iudge of mens harts and not of their open deeds? Besides such Papists are feigned and not at all proued. And if there had byn any such, they should haue byn termed Depyers not Protesters. Lastly such men could not haue byn the visible Church of Protestants, because they denied their fayth and professed Antichristianity; and consequently were no holy men, of whom only

1. Cont. Petil. c. 28.

Lib. 2. de Baptis. c. 3

their inuisible Church consisteth.

8. Tenthly I argue by enquiring the manner, how the Protestant church in former tymes was in Popery; to wit, whether it professed the substance of the Protestant fayth, or no: and whether it communicated with Papists in their Popish worship or not? Protestants, like men vncertaine answere diuersly to this question. D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 3. cap. 3. pag. 474. sayth: *Our Churches were alwayes in the middest of Papists churches, distinct from Papists in Communion and Profession.* But this is soone refuted. First, because it cannot be proued. *And to cast out words and proue naught, what is it* (as S. Augustin sayth) *but to dote?* Besides if the Protestant Church had professed Protestancy, she had byn knowne to Papists; and the same had also byn if she had not communicated with them. For as D. Andrews writeth of the Catholikes in England: *They come not to seruice, they heare not sermons, they refuse to take the Communion, without this or any other oath one may know them to be Papists.* But she was not knowne to Papists, because not only all Papists, but also Protestants deny that. Besides otherwise Catholiks would not haue so earnestly enquired of Protestants, where their Church had byn heretofore. Moreouer Catholikes had persecuted them as they persecuted Luther, so soone as he was knowne for a Protestant. Lastly, because Protestants cannot name any Papists, who knew of their Church before Luthers tyme. Others therefore say, that those imaginary Protestants professed their fayth, if not at other tymes, yet at least at the point of death. D. Whitaker loc. cit. pag. 473: *Many at the point of death, if not before, professed their fayth.* The same sayth Luther of priuate Masse tom. 7. fol. 237. and Lobech. 11 Disput. 20. To which D. White in

Cont. Parm. c. 2. 8.

in defence of his way cap. 4. pag. 424. addeth, that *they renounceth Papistry also in the agony of their conscience.* And Hunnius before cited, not knowing what certainly to determine, sayth: that *they did either openly gird at Papistry, or secretly with themselues detest it, or at least in the last examen of tentations (the stable of errour being fired) did hold the foundation of saluation.* But to speake with S. Augustin; *VVho sayth this, but he that sayth what he will, and will not heare what is true?* They say that in the Scripture alone that saying of Pythagoras Schollers (he sayd it) taketh place. But if they vsed not this Pythagoricall priuiledge, they would be more dumbe then fishes. What man or diuell told them this profession of their men at the houre of death? How learnt they that, which at that tyme no man could fish out? Againe, if only at the houre of death they professed Protestancy, they were Protestants no longer then they lay a dying; and consequently the Protestant church endured no longer then some of her children were dying. A strange Church certes, that liued no longer then her children dyed; nor at any tyme drew breath, but whiles they gaue vp the ghost. Wherefore they find out other deuises to say, that those feigned Protestants communicated with Papists and professed their fayth in things lawfull, as in Baptisme, reading of the Scriptur, and such like; but not in things vnlawfull. Thus Reineccius in the 4. tome of his armoure cap. 4. Thou seest reader, that as these Protestants had their being only by these mens imaginations, so they did, or did not, what, or in what manner they will haue them. *O great fabulosity*, (that I may cry out which S. Epiphanius) *of them, who vtter these things? so manifest it is, that this is a shop rather of lyers, then of those who haue the shape of the promise of life and of verity.*

lib. 5. cont. Iul. c. 4.

Bulling. in Compend. fidei l. 1. c. 3.

derstanding. For who besides his owne imagination, told Reinoccius, that those Protestants deuided thus their Communion with Papists? who besides himselfe heard euer of such a halfe-communion?

How impious their church in Popery was.

9. Wherefore others of them do absolutely say, that their imaginary Protestant Church in Popery communicated with Papists, and professed their fayth. For thus writeth Luther in psalm. Grad. tom. 3. fol. 568: *The Church vnder Antichrist had no true Ministery in her worship, but was forced to keep the very Babylonicall and beastlie rites of Papists.* The same he intimateth tom. 7. lib. de Missa priuata fol. 236. & 237. and lib cont. Papatum fol. 456. Osiander also in the epist. dedicatory of his 8. Century sayth of those Protestants, that *although from their heart they disallowed the Popish errors, yet they durst not professe their owne opinions; but neglected not the externall rites, and were carryed away with the common custome as it were with a torrent, for to do those things which others did; whose weaknesse* (sayth he) *God did beare withall and pardon.* And the same pardon Luther de Missa priuata fol. 237. bestoweth vpon them saying: *No sinne could hurt them, but God must pardon the miserable, afflicted, oppressed and captiue Church.* Thus these men haue Gods pardon in their hands, that when they please, God must pardon those, who all their life tyme denyed their faith and serued Antichrist and idolatry. Iunius also lib. 4. de Eccl. cap. 5. sayth, that the Church in former tyme *was all one with the Romish.* Againe: *She communicated with the Roman Church in worship of God euery where, so long as she was suffered to communicate in pure worship, in right fayth, and good conscience.* Forsooth the Synagogue of Antichrist, (as they account the Roman church) vseth pure worship, or the Church of Christ communicateth with her in right fayth, and good conscience. And D. Whitaker

taker Cont. 4. quæst. 5. cap. 3. pag. 482. Where he shews those feigned Protestants, Perhaps used Popish ceremonies for customes sake. And pag. 489: Antichrist deceived the world and seduced them. The very elect erred. And Cont. 5. quæst. 3. cap. 3. pag. 474: In Popery there were many (Protestants) who communicated with Papists. Gerlachius tom. 3. disp. 22: They were driven into the common opinion with an universall and fatall overflow of superstitions. And Casaubon epist. ad Perron pag. 30. writeth, that the godly communicated with Babylon. D. Field lib. 3. de Eccles. cap. 13: The authors of those (Popish) errours, and those that were free from them were of the same Communion. D. White in his way pag. 171: The children of God abide in the communion of the Roman Church. And in the defence cap. 44. pag. 394: We do not hold a definite number of persons, distinct from the members of the Church of Rome, and living apart in another society by themselves in secret, as it were the 7. sleepers lying hid in a mountaine: but we affirme the company lived in the middest of the Church of Rome it selfe, and were the visible Professors thereof. This also is that, which Calvin would, when 4. Institut. cap. 2. §. 12. he sayth, that his Churches in Popery were prophaned with sacrilegious impiety, corrupted and almost killed with pernicious doctrines; in which lay halfe buryed, the ghospell overwhelmed, godlines banished, and all things so out of order, as there seemed rather the face of Babylon then of the city of God. And upon the 23. of the Acts: We complaine that the Church was corrupted of them (Papists) the temple of God prophaned, that is defiled little from a prophane one. So, sayth S. Augustine, to what a precipice, the difficulty to find where to get out hath brought those men. They sayd their Church was in Popery, and afterward found not how to creep out, but by this most steep & craggy precipice. For what steeper precipice, what greater absurdity can there be, then to say that the church

L. 2. cont. Crescon. c. 27.

of

of God (which the Protestants will haue their to be) for many ages denyed her fayth, professed infidelity, forsook Christ, worshipped Antichrist, or to vse their owne words, *Did vse very Babylonicall and Antichristian rites, was corrupted with pernicious doctrine, prophaned with sacrilegious impiety, and out of which godlines was banished?* *God forbid* (sayth S. Cyprian) *that a company of fallen persons should be called the Church.* Againe: *God forbid, & his mercy and inuincible power neuer permit, that a company of fallen persons be called the Church.* And Beza himselfe: *The Church is a community of Saints, not a company of excommunicated or sacrilegious persons.* And shall we think, that before Luther arose the Church of God for many ages was nothing else but a company of fallen, sacrilegious, hypocrites, denyers of Christ, and worshippers of Antichrist? Is such a company the holy Church? Is the Communion of such, the Communion of Saints which we beleiue in our Creed? Is such a society the spouse and mysticall body of Christ, the wife of the lambe, the Kingdom of God? Surely a fit Church for Protestants, and a fit company, to which the forsakers of the Catholike Church may adioyne themselues, and most worthy to be eschewed & detested of all that loue Christs or their owne honour. For who is he, either pious or well in his wits, who will make himselfe of that company which for many ages consisted all of lapsed Hypocrites, denyers of Christ, and worshippers of Antichrist? The whole Scriptures and Fathers say that the spouse of Christ is honest and chast, and cannot be deflowed. But this protestant harlot did for many ages prostitute her selfe to Antichrist.

Epist. 40.
Epist. 37.
Epist. 1.

10. Moreouer this kind of company which thus communicated with Antichrist and professed his

his doctrine, could not be the visible protestant Church. For her they define to be a company which professeth Christs true doctrine, and rightly vseth his Sacraments. But this foresayd company, as themselues write, Durst not professe their opinion, had no Ministery, & did obserue Babylonicall and heathenish rites. Nor were they their inuisible Church, which alone they will haue to be the true Catholike and proper Church, because (according to all their opinions) is the company of Saints & elect only. The Confession of Ausparg. art. 7: *The Church properly so called, is the congregation of Saints, who truly beleeue and obey Christ.* And D. Whitaker cont. 2. quæst. 3. cap. 3: *Thus we define the Catholike Church, It is a company of holy men, whome God hath chosen in Christ, to euerlasting life. This definition* (sayth he) *excludeth all hypocrites.* But those who worshipped Antichrist were no Saints, obeyed not Christ, were hypocrites. Therefore they were no Catholike or true church. Againe, it is the common doctrine of Protestants that naughty & great sinners are no mẽbers of the true church. For thus the Confession of the Low-countries art. 29: *Hypocrites belong not properly to the Church.* Caluin 4. Instit. cap. 1. §. 7: *Into that Church, which is indeed before God, none are admitted but such as both by grace of adoption are the sonnes of God, and by sanctification of the spirit true members of Christ.* Peter Martyr in his places tit. de Eccles. col. 1368: *We affirme that such* (wicked) *men are not indeed & before God members of the Church.* Aretius in locis part. 3. fol. 501: *The Church, properly so called, consisteth only of the true members of Christ.* Bucer lib. de vi & vsu Ministerij pag. 558: *The true Church consisteth only of those that are borne a new.* D. Whitaker cap. 3. cit: *We all beleeue that Catholike Church, which we professe in our Creed, to consist of no euill or reprobate persons, but only of the elect, iust, and holy.* And c. 7:

Conf. Aug. art. 29

Ill mẽ not the true church by Protestãs

We

VVe deny ill men to belong to the Church, which is the body of Christ. M. Perkins in his exposition of the Creed col. 795: An ill man cannot be a member of the Church. And Franciscus loc. 11. de Eccl: Ill men are only in name members of the Church. And finally Musculus in locis tit. de Eccl. pag. 299: Not so much as the name of the Church ought to be given to the wicked. But they who were such as the Protestants before described, were no Saints, were not just, were not sanctified; but ill, wicked, hypocrites, if euer there were any: therefore they could not be the true Catholike and proper Church before God. Furthermore Protestants vse to teach, that those who communicate with Papists do cut themselues from the true Church. The French Confession art. 28: VVe think all those who adioyne themselues to those (Popish) assiums and communicate with them, do separat themselues from the body of Christ. Luther in cap. 13. Genes. tom. 6. fol. 163: VVho acknowledgeth the Pope for master, he hath no part with Christ. And in cap. 28. fol. 396: If the Pope must be worshipped, Christ must be denyed. And de Missa priuata tom. 7. fol. 475: VVhosoeuer is vnder the Pope and obeyeth him cannot be saued. Caluin against Seruet. pag. 607: Is it not a prophanation of the sacred vnity, to professe one God and faith with an impious and prophane company? And Respons. ad Versip. pag. 362: How wicked and foule treachery is it to abide in that sacrilegious company (of Papists)? And D. Whitaker ad Rat. 3. Campiani: None abide with the Lambe in the mountaine, who haue any commerce with Antichrist. And Caluin in Confutat. Hollandi & lib. de vitandis superstitionibus, bringeth many proofes to shew that the faithfull may not communicate with the false Church, and thereto citeth the letters of Melanchton, Bucer, Peter Martyr, and those of Zurich: and the same is commonly taught of Protestants. How then did not

those

those protestants separate themselues from the body of Christ? how were they saued, who in tymes past communicated with papists? How were they saued vnlesse God be an acceptour of persons and tymes, that he will cut of some from his body, and from hope of saluation, who communicate with Antichrist, and not others, at these and not in former tymes. Againe, protestants teach that the Church ought to professe her fayth, as besides the testimonies before repeated, the Preface of the Confession of Saxony sayth: *They that are demanded must needs tell the doctrine.* And the Confession of Bohemia art. 2: *They teach, that they must vndoubtedly beleeue all the articles of the Creed, and confesse them with the mouth.* Luther in 1. petri cap. 2. tom. 5. fol. 464: *If any new, as the Emperour or other Prince, should aske me my fayth, I must plainly confesse it to him.* And de Seru. Arbit. tom. 2. fol. 432: *Truth and doctrine must alwayes be preached openly, and neuer kept secret or couert: and turned away* D. Feild lib. 1. de Eccl. cap. 10: *For seeing the Church is the multitude of them that shall be saued vnlesse he make confession vnto saluation, for fayth hid in the heart and concealed doth not suffice, it cannot be but they that are of the true Church must by the profession of the truth make themselues knowne in such sort that ours.* And the Preface of the Syntagme of Confessions: *When euery one ought, according to the Apostles precept, giue a confession of his hope; how much more the Church?* And D. Whitaker Cont. 4. quæst. 6. cap. 2. pag. 696: *True fayth cannot more be separated from confession with the mouth, then fire from heat, or the sunne from its brightnes and beames.* What fayth then had those protestants, which, as is sayd, durst not professe their mind? And Cont. 2. quæst. 3. cap. 2. pag. 472: *It is not lawfull for the godly to dissemble true Religion, or make shew of false; nor to conceale what they think of Religion, if they be examined of them who haue authority to aske them of*

their fayth. But it is not credible that in so many ages, in no part of the Christian world, no Catholike Magistrate should aske any protestant of his fayth, especially if it be true that Luther writeth in psalm. 22. tom. 3. fol. 344. that *Papists do so examine the body of the Church, that all her bones may be counted, that is, none of them can by hid. Wherefore we must not imagine that there are any hidden bones of Christ, all are bewrayed and counted, whersoeuer they are, either by the assaults of secret confession, or by the tortours or examiners.* Which sheweth, that if there had byn any true protestants heretofore, they would haue byn discouered.

11. Finally they are brought to these straights, that sometymes they say, that the protestant church, (which they imagine was heretofore in popery,) did consist of those who were papists both in opinion and profession. This Caluin intimateth in the words before cited, when he sayth that his church was corrupted with pestilent doctrine. And Luther de Missa priuata tom. 7. fol. 231. saying: *The very elect were seduced in that great darknesse.* And in cap. 9. Isaiæ tom. 4. tol. 95: *Behold* (sayth he) *the whole face of the Churches vnder Popery. Did not they all who truly felt the burden of sinne imagine that they should by good works satisfy for their sinnes?* Which thing alone would suffice to blot them out of the role of protestants. D. White in defence of his way cap. 36. pag. 350. sayth those imaginary protestants were corrupted, some more some lesse, with those errors, which (sayth he) now we fly. And cap. 40. pag. 394. graunteth, that they were infected with damnable heresies. D. Whitaker lib. 2. de Scriptura cap. 8. sect. vlt. sayth: *They were beset with most thick darknes.* Nappet in cap. 12. Apocal. pag. 195. that their visible Church in tymes past: *Wholy embraced the errors of merits and indulgen-*

dulgences &c. And Morgeſtierus tract. de Eccl. pag. 411 *Theſe things were in tymes paſt to be forgiuen the godly, that they beleeued the Pope to be Chriſts vicar, and head of the church, Popery to be the church, Saints to be prayed vnto, Maſſe to be the Lords ſupper.* Are theſe men (think you) in their wits, who call them godly, and ſay they muſt be pardoned, who beleeued Antichriſt to be Chriſts vicar, Antichriſts Synagogue to be the Church of Chriſt, and horrible idolatry (ſuch as they account Maſſe & prayer to Saints) to be ſeruice of Chriſt? The ſame alſo they meane, when they challenge the ſimple & ignorant Papiſts for theirs, or confeſſe the vulgar Roman Church to be the true Church, or (as others of them ſpeake) graunt the Roman Church, but deny popery, the popiſh, or Roman popiſh Church. For they imagine, that the ſimple Catholike people neither doth now, nor in former tymes did beleeue theſe points of fayth, which themſelues deny. But this they feigne of the ſimple Catholike people, and cannot proue it. Beſides, there is no Catholike ſo ſimple, as doth not vertually beleeue all points of Catholike fayth, which proteſtants deny, ſith he actually profeſſeth to beleeue whatſoeuer the Catholike Church teacheth. Neither is there any at all, who doth not beleeue iuſtification by good works, which point alone would ſuffice to make them no proteſtants. Beſides, Caluin 4. Inſtitut. cap. 8. ſayth that we affirme him *to be no Chriſtian, who doth not vndoubtedly agree to all points of doctrine, as well affirmatiue as negatiue.* And the ſame ſayth D. Whitaker Cont. 2. queſt. 5. cap. 1. pag. 519. D. Morton part 1. Apol. lib. 1. cap. 9. and D. Willet in the preface of his Synopſis. Yea, as before we rehearſed, they confeſſe that before Luthers ſmolt all from head to foot were drowned in the

Cap 2.

pudies of Popery, that none dreamed of that which is the cheifest point of Protestancy. Wherfore Schusselburg tom. 8. Catal. Hæret. pag. 440. seemeth to say, That befor Luther arose popery was the true church like as the Synagogue of the Iewes was before the comming of Christ, for thus he writeth: *Popery, as indeede her etofore, signifieth that company, which at least in her tyme had the true Church with it. Such were the Iewes before the comming of Christ, and the Papists before the comming of Luther.* His meaning (as I suppose) is that as the Christian Church is in state another church from the Synagogue; because it hath other Sacraments, other Sacrifyce, and more points of fayth, and Christ another founder of the Church distinct from Moyses; so the Protestant Church is a distinct Church from the ancient Christian Church, and Luther not only another Elias, as they call him, but also another Messias, a founder and beginner of another Church, distinct from that of Christ, at least as far as his church differed from the Synagogue. Behold Christian Reader wherto all their winding, turning, and doubling about the being of their Church in Popery, is come.

L. 20. cont. Faust. c. 12. *Surely* (as S. Augustin sayd, against the Manichees) *their imaginations have lost all wayes. For they are nothing, but the visions of frantike men.* For their remayneth no probable way to defend, that their Church was heretofore in Popery. It is mere frenzy to think, that it was in Popery virtually and implicitly, like as a plant is in the seed, or a man in a child, as the Christian Church once was in the Synagogue, or that it was openly distinct in Communion and Profession from Papists: or that it consisteth of such, which either in hart, or at least in Profession were Papists; or finally, that the Church of God (such as they will have

the Protestant (to be) was for many ages in a different, yea a most opposite church; where neither by diuine nor humane testimony it can be proued to haue byn, neither can there any way be imagined, by which it may with any appearance or probability be sayd to haue byn there, Thus (sayth S. Augustine) *do they dote, who not abiding true doctrine, turne to fables.* lib. 20. cōt. Faust. c. 21.

12. And out of these, wherewith we haue shewed, that the Protestant Church heretofore was not in Popery, is refuted also Zanchius Præfat. lib. de Natura Dei, where he sayth that their brethren in tymes past liued in some obscure valies and Mountaines, and met at night. And D. Fulke lib. de Succes. pag. 324. saying, that in Europe the Church was by Antichrist thrust into obscure places; but least they should be tript in their lying, they name neither those mountaines, nor valleys, nor places, nor their night-owle-brethren, nor finally proue any thing. But as S. Augustin sayd of Faustus: *They say it & neuer they neuer seeke to proue it.* L. 14. cont. Faust. c. 9. Or as Christ sayd of the aduersary man, they sow cockle and depart. It suffiseth for these new Pythagorians, to powre out lyes like oracles: for they assure themselues that with reckelesse men they will find credit of themselues, & like weeds grow without tilling. Hence also is refuted the same Fulke in cap. 10. Apocal. Where he affirmeth his brethren heretofore haue lived in the Alpes, in the Appenine Mountaines, and in the Hercinian Forest. He might better haue sayd they liued in the Wilderness of Vtopia, for he proueth nothing. O man L. 18. cont. that I may cry out which S. Augustine) *thinking only Faust. c. 18 of his owne talke, and not thinking of any gainesayer!* Against *whom thou not know, or doest thou not feele with the heart of* l. 4. cont. *that man former, that in dispute where truth is sought, where* Cres. c. 54.

proofe followeth not, that the rule is vaine and foolish. Wherefore now let vs heare their arguments, or rather Sophismes, wherewith sometymes they endeauour to proue, that their Church was in tymes past in Popery.

The Sophismes, wherewith some Protestant make shew to proue that their Church was heretofore in Popery, refuted.

CHAP. X.

THE first argument, wherewith Protestants would seeme to proue, that their Church in former tymes was in Popery, is grounded vpon that saying Apocal. 18. Goe out of her (Babylon) my people. Therefore Gods people were in Babylon, that is, (say they) in Popery. Thus argueth Luther in cap. 21. Genes. tom. 6. fol. 144. And in cap. 19. fol. 234. The Magdeburgians in Præfat. Centur. 8. Plessy lib. de Eccles. cap. 10. and others commonly. Yea M. Perkins in his reformed Catholike tract. 22. writeth that by this commandement, it may be gathered that the true Church is, and was long tyme in the Roman Church. Wherein he speakes more truly then he meant. For the true Church is and was alwayes in the Romane; but the Protestant, neither is, nor was there. To the argument I answere, that this place can be no sufficient ground of fayth among the Protestants, because their Angel, their Apostle, and Euangelist Martyn Luther, denyeth the Apocalipse to be Canonicall Scripture. Againe, though indeed it be canonicall Scripture, yet for the most part it is

obscure

obscure, as but very few places therof are fit to ground any point of fayth; as is euident both by the booke it selfe, which is well nigh all Mysticall and allegoricall, and by the iudgement of the Fathers and confession of Protestants. For thus sayth S. Denis Patriarch of Alexandria of the Apocalipse: *I verily think, that almost in euery sentence there lyeth some mysticall and meruellous sense.* Like wise S. Hierome: *The Apocalipse hath as many mysteries as words.* And S. Augustin: *In the booke of the Apocalipse many obscure things are told, and there are few things therein, by light whereof the rest may be sought ought with labour.* And with Protestants D. Andrewes in his answere to Bellarmines Apology cap. 9: *Is he ignorant, that concerning the Apocalipse nothing certaine or of fayth is yet prescribed by the Church, that it may be lawfull to vse one only kind of interpretation and no other; as if it were so cleare and euident that it were a haynous offence to leaue it, or to dissent any way from it. Yea as any may with greatest probability shew the prophesies there to be fulfilled, so is it free for any to vse his iudgement & to follow his own opinion in explicating them.* And D. Whitaker Cont. 4. quest. 5. cap. 3 pag. 677: *It is well inough knowne that Iohn in the Apocalipse speaketh not of cleare and open matters, but of obscure and hidden.* M. Brightman in his Preface of the Apocalipse: *In so great abundance of ancient and new expositions, the Apocalipse yet, as all agree, needeth an Apocalipse.* And M. Sheldon in his booke of the miracles of Antichrist cap. 4. pag. 54 calleth it *a darck & Mysticall prophecy, in which* (sayth he) *quot verba, tot latent Mysteria.* And pag. 226: *The Apocalipse is a booke wholy mysticall, which doth (excepting some few doctrinall rules and exhortations to vertue) in types, figures, formes, and resemblances, describe and foretell the future euents of the church.* How then can Protestants gather certainly out of the Apocalipse, that their Church heretofore was in Popery?

Euseb. l. 7. c. 24.

Epist. ad Paulin.

lib 20. de Ciuit. c. 17.

But, as Luther in cap. 9. Genes. tom. 6. fol. 124. speaketh of the Anabaptists and others: *The Anabaptists make so much of obscure places as the Apocalipse, because there they may feigne any thing.* And in cap. 11. fol. 136: *Ambitious heads thinke a great matter, if they giue their iudgment freely of obscure places, and after stubbornly maintayne their opinion.* And Præfat. in Cantica tom. 4. fol. 47: *Some do put all their labour in hard places, thinking it a commendation of their wit to medle with those matters, which others by reason of their obscurity do fly, & because in obscure places euery one may diuine and follow his owne head.*

VVhy Protestãts accoũt so much of the Apoc.

2. Thirdly I answere, that the foresayd place is allegoricall, mysticall, and obscure, and therefore not fit to ground fayth vpon. That it is mysticall and allegoricall, is manifest, because Babylon doth not litterally, but at most mystically signify Popery. That also the sense which Protestants frame thereof is obscure, is euident, because they cannot either by any part or by any circumstance therof, clearly shew, that by Babylon is meant Popery. Besides, neither any of the Fathers, nor of those imaginary Protestants before Luther, did perceiue this sense; other wise some of them would haue obeyed Gods commandement, and gone out of Popery. But it were playne madnes to vrge an incredible thing, (as is that Protestants were heretofore in Popery) to be believed certainly, for one mysticall & obscure place. *VVho* (sayth S. Augustin) *without great impudency will goe about to expound for himselfe, any thing spoken in Allegory, vnlesse he haue manifest places, by which the obscure may be lightned.* Let them bring therefore some euident place, wherein Babylon signifieth Popery. Luther also sayth: *If in the new testament the signification of a figure be not cleare, we must not rely vpon it, because the diuell, an excellent craftsman, playeth with figures, & is*

Epist. 48.

Harton part. 2. l. 2. c. 3.

if he catch a sense which without certaine ground wrasteth the Scripture to allegories, he vseth to cast him here and there like a dye. And in cap. 3. Genes. tom. 6. fol. 52: *An Allegory serueth nothing for proofe.* Kemnice also 1. part. exam. tit. de epist. Apost. pag. 79: *We say, that a sentence is not to be builded vpon any obscure place of Scripture, which cannot be proued out of other cleare places.* Peter Martyr in locis tom. 2. tract. de Missa: *An opinion is not to be founded in doubtfull words.* Sadeel ad Sophism. Turrian. loc. 11. pag. 597: *The most learned interpreters do teach that Anagogicall arguments must rely vpon cleare and expresse testimonies, if they will breed fayth.* And Pareus lib. 4. de Iustificat. cap. 15. pag. 1120: *Testimony for a false opinion is in vaine sought out of an Allegoricall and most obscure place.* But as the Fathers haue noted, it was euer the humour of heretiks, to seeke some pretext of allegoricall and obscure places. Of the Gnostiques, thus, writeth S. Irenæus lib. 1. cap. 1: *Whereas many parables and Allegories are recited, which may be drawne into diuerse senses, they craftely accommodating that which is ambiguous vnto their deuise, do lead into captiuity from the truth, those which haue a weake fayth in Christ.* And S. Augustin lib. de Vnitat. ca. 24. sayth to the Donatists: *Yee willingly abide in obscure matters, that you may not be compelled to confesse cleare matters.* And of heretiks in generall thus speaketh Tertullian: *Diuers presumptions of men will not acknowledge those things, by which they may be ouercome; and relye vpon those, which they haue falsely forged, and haue taken out of vncertaine rytes.* Againe: *This is the custome of frowarde men, idiots, and heretikes, by occasion of some doubtfull passage to arme themselues against an army of the whole testament.* And Clement 7. Stromatum: *They seek out doubtfull speaches, and turne them to vphold their opinions.* The like writeth Luther of Anabaptistes. And others, as hath bynnow rehearsed. Wherfore Protestants do follow

Heretiks seeke out obscure places.

Tertul. præscr. c. 27.

De pæn. c. 10.

the custome of Gnostikes, Donatists, Anabaptists, froward idiots, and heretikes, whiles they fit the Allegory of Babylon to their turne, whiles they willingly abide in obscure matters, and make such account of the Apocalipse becaufe there they haue leaue to feigne any thing, whiles they rely vpon thofe things which they take out of vncertainties, and by occafion of one ambiguous and doubtfull place, are armed againft an army of fentences of the Scripture, which teach that neither Popery is Babylon, nor Protestants the people of God. Moreouer Donatists for the very like place Isaiæ 52: *Goe backe againe out of the midft of her*, would proue that they ought to go out of the Catholik Church of their tyme, as witneffeth S. Auguftin, and Danæus confeffeth lib. 3. de Eccl. c. 9. who alfo in lib. 1. Auguft. cont. Parmen. hath thefe words: *The argument of the Donatifts out of Ifay the 52. is as, That we ought to goe backe and goe out of the midft of Babylon.* And the Anabaptifts in Zuinglius tom. 2. in Elencho fol. 21. Out of this felfe fame place of the Apocalipfe, did gather that they ought to goe from Proteftants. Why then may wee not fay with D. Whitaker: *Our aduerfaries ferue themfelues of the fame weapons, whereof moft wicked heretikes did; and herein fhew themfelues to be nothing leffe then Catholikes.* Moreouer I fay, that if I lift to expound Scriptures at my pleafure, I might fay, and more probably too then proteftants, that by the foreffayd words God commandeth Proteftants to goe out of proteftancy. For Proteftancy may well be called Babylon, becaufe it is a Maffe and confufion of oppofite hereffies, where almoft euery one hath a fayth of his owne, and fpeaketh a peculiar language, nor vnderftandeth the tongue or doctrine of another. And Proteftants may be called the people of God in that they

Ib. de vnic. bapt. c. 14. l. 2. cont. Parmen. c. 18. l. 2. cõt. Gaud. c. 9.

Cont. 2. q. 6. c. 23.

they are baptized, and therein dedicated to his seruice; and pretend the fayth of Christ as did Israel euen after it had forsaken the Synagogue; And as Caluin sayth that God calleth euen the disobedient, his seruants, as Nabuchodonozor in Hieremy, and as God hath both good and faythfull seruants, and naughty and vnfaythfull; so hath he good & naughty people. *De præsdest. art. 22.*

3. Secondly I answere, that the argument which can be framed out of this place, to proue that which the Protestants write of their churches being in Popery before Luther arose, to wit: *Goe you my people out of Babylon. Therefore before Luthers tyme the church was in Popery, and so secret as for many ages she was not seene either of her own or of others*; is a meere Sophisme. First because one vnknown thing is here proued by another more vnknown, a false thing by another not only false, but also impossible. For more vnknowne it is, more incredible, more impossible that the Protestant church should be the people of God, or that Babylon, out of which Gods people is bidden to goe, Popery: then that Protestants haue byn heretofore amongst Papists. For this, although it be both false and incredible, yet it is not impossible, as the other is. How then can they proue vnto vs, that they were heretofore in Popery, by affirming that they are that people of God, and Popery that Babylon, sith this is to vs farre more incredible, then the other. Let Babylon sometyme in Scripture mystically signify the citty of Rome; let it also signify the number of the wicked both faythfull and Infidels; but in Scripture it neuer signifieth a certaine religion, and least of all Popery. Besides his Maiesty in his Epistle to Cardinall Peron, hath those words: *What that Babylon is, out*

of which Gods people is commanded to go, the King enquireth not in this place, nor pronounceth any thing of that matter. And if his Maiesty will not pronounce what that Babylon is, why should Ministers do it? Secondly, it is a Sophisme, because there are many things in the consequent, which are not at all in the antecedent, although it be vnderstood as Protestants would. And therefore herein they not only proue an vnknowne thing by another more vnknowne, but some things they proue only by themselues, that is, they affirme them, and proue them not at all. For let the Protestants be the people of God; and let Popery be that Babylon (which they can neuer proue) nevertheless that the Protestant Church had byn in Popery so long tyme, to wit, so many ages, and in such manner, to wit so secret as she was altogeather inuisible either to her own or to others, can no way be gathered out of the foresayd words, though they were expounded according to the Protestants mind.

4. Their second argument they ground vpon that, 2. Thessal. 2. that Antichrist shall sit in the temple of God, which they expound, as that the Pope should sit in the true, that is, according to them, the Protestant Church, and consequently that heretofore the Pope ruled ouer Protestants. To which I answer, that this argument is a Sophisme like to the former. First, because it proueth an vnknown thing by another more vnknowne; and one vntruth, by another both vntrue and impossible. For it is more incredible to vs, that Protestants are the temple of God, or the Pope Antichrist, then that they were heretofore amongst Papists. Secondly if hence they Inferre, that their Church was so long in Popery, and in such manner as we haue recited out of their words, they

will

will inferre that in the conſequence, wherein there is no figure in the Antecedent, although it were expounded to their deſire. Thirdly I ſay, that there can be no certainty gathered out of this place, becauſe it is obſcure, as appeareth both by it ſelfe, and by the different expoſitions thereof, and by the iudgement of S. Auguſtine, who writeth thus: *In what temple of God Antichriſt is to ſit as God, it is vncertaine, whether in that ruine of the temple which Salomon built, or in the Church.* Againe: *I truly profeſſe my ſelfe not to know, what he ſayd; yet I will relate the ſuſpicions of men, which I haue heard or read of the matter.* And againe: *One in this ſort, another in that, gheſſeth at the obſcure words of the Apoſtle.* Yea D. Andrews intimateth, that it cannot be certainly gathered hence, that the Pope is Antichriſt, when he ſayth: *It is probably gathered out of the 2. chap. 2. Theſſal. That the Biſhop of Rome is Antichriſt.* But we regard not, whence they probably gather what they pleaſe, but only whence they can certainly & vndoubtedly proue what they ſay. Fourthly I ſay, that whatſoeuer is the temple of God wherein Antichriſt ſhall ſit, this place it ſelfe ſheweth, that the Pope is not Antichriſt, becauſe he ſitteth not in the Church of God as God, but as Biſhop, and as Gods vicar. Fifthly I adde, that the Proteſtants themſelues do not firmly beleiue, much leſſe as a point of their fayth, that the Pope is Antichriſt, howſoeuer they vſe the name of Antichriſt as a bugg to feare children. For Melanethon, as Schmalkaldus reporteth, *ſeemed to doubt whether the Pope were Antichriſt, or no.* D. Whitaker lib. 1. cont. Duræum ſect. 33. ſayth: *In the ſame tyme, we muſt needs probably and iuſtly ſuſpect the Pope to be Antichriſt.* And Cont. 4. queſt. 5. cap. 3. *Many who care not much for the Pope, do not think, that it can be proued that he is Antichriſt.* And his Maieſty in his Monitory epiſtle

Lib. 20. de Ciuit. c. 19.

Reſpon. ad Apol. Bellar. c. 2.

Proteſtants not certaine that the Pope is Antichriſt.

Lib. 1. Tortur. Tor. Col. 3.

epistle pag. 70. *Surely for so much as pertayneth to defend Antichrist, I would not urge a thing so obscure and hidden as a matter necessary to be believed of all Christians.* And the same sayth Moulins in his defence of that Epistle. To which his Maiesty addeth pag. 142. these words: *If any list to refute thus my ghesse concerning Antichrist, &c.* Behold how the Protestants themselues doubt, account it but a suspicion, a ghesse, an obscure matter, and not needfull to be believed, that the Pope is Antichrist. How then can they certainly gather out of the foresayd place, that the Pope sat among Protestants? Yea some of thē deny the Pope to be the true Antichrist. For thus Luther in cap. 9. Genes. tom. 6. fol. 122: *We hold the Turck for the true Antichrist.* Zanchius lib. 1. Epist. ad Stuckium: *I am perswaded that the name of Antichrist agreeth rather to the Turck then to Pope.* And in his answere to an Arian, Antithes. 21. col. 879: *The Bishop of Rome is not that Antichrist whereof is meant 2. Thessal. 2.* And in his Disceptation betwixt two Deuines pag. 637. and respons. ad calumnias pag. 217. he plainly denyeth, that the Pope *is that notable and singular Antichrist, whereof the Fathers speake.* And his opinion herein many Protestant vniuersities do iudge probable, namely the vniuersity of Marspurg, Heidelberg, Zurich, & Basle, among which, that of Zurich hath these words: *The 2. Thesis of Antichrist, cannot be reiected as heretical, seeing it is very probable. For almost all the Fathers are of that mind.* Againe: *Since malice daily increaseth, nothing letteth but at the last some notable one may come who in impiety surpasseth all the enemies of the Ghospell.* Vorstius also in his Antibellarm. pag. 79: *We who discourse more aduisedly of this matter, do graunt that it is very likely, that yet some one shall arise, to whom all the qualites of Antichrist may agree in the highest degree.* What certainty then can Protestants haue out of the foresayd place,

for

for their purpose, sith some of their best learned doe but doubt, and others deny, that the Pope is that Antichrist, whereof S. Paul speaketh?

5. The third argument they wring out of the 12. Apocal. where it is sayd, that the dragon shall cause the woman, that is, the Church, to fly into the wildernesse. This also is a fallacy, not vnlike to the former. First, because it is more vnknowne that the Protestant church is the woman, or the true church, or the Pope that Dragon, or the Popery the desert, he that Protestants were heretofor amongst Papists. Againe there is no speach at all, that the Church shold be so long tyme and so secret as Protestants say their church was in Popery. Yea the tyme which this woman was to abide in the wildernesse, is set downe, to be 1260 *dayes*, or (as it is sayd cap. 20.) a small tyme. And as Luther vpon Daniel tom. 4. fol 265. and Bullinger conc. 46 in Apocal. write: *Almost all Doctours attribute but* 3. *yeares and halfe to the persecution of Antichrist.* Wherefore these kind of testimonies, by which Protestants make shew to proue that their Church was heretofore in Popery, are but as S. Augustin speaketh of the like testimonies vsed by Donatists: *Slender sparres of delayes, wherewith you vnderprop an euill cause, by delaying. But we demaund some manifest testimony. Therefore bring out some manifest, produce some thing that needeth no interpreter, or if you cannot performe that which so iustly we demaund of you, beleeue truth, hold your peace, sleep a nap, and after waken to saluation.* De vnit. Ec. 20. 23.

6. Their 4. Sophisme they draw out of reason in this sort: As soone as Protestancy was publikly preached, many came out of Popery, and followed it. Therefore there were who in Popery did beleeue it. This fallacy is nothing better, then the former. For if

if it be reduced to a Syllogisme, it will be framed orderly vpon this principle: If any in a company do follow the preaching of a new doctrine, there were some therin, that before tym believed it; which principle is manifestly false. For neuer any heretiks preached, whome some vnlettled Christians did not follow; and yet who will say that there was neuer any hercly preached which before had not byn believed of some Christians. Besides Protestants account it for a wonderfull miracle, that at the beginning so many Papists came out of Popery vnto them; but it had byn no shadow of miracle, if before they had byn Protestãts. Moreuer the number of Papists forsaking Popery argueth not, that before tymes they had byn Protestants, but that they were vnlettled Papists, who as the Scripture speaketh, were carryed about with euery wind of doctrine; and that protestancy is a voluptuous and licentius doctrine, because (as Caluin sayth) *deceitfull doctrines do soone bewray themselues, whiles they are admitted of all men with gentle eares, and are hearde of the world applauding thereto.*

Epist. Monitor. pag. 207.

Whitak. cont. 2. q. 5. c. 8. Pleff. de Eccles. c. 11. Badeel. Reflectat. Possev. c. 10.

Ephes. 4.

Praef. Inst.

7. Of all which hath byn sayd in this and the former chapter I frame my fift demonstration in this manner: *If the Protestant Church and Religion were no where before Luther arose, it was not all. But before him it was no wher. Therfore not at all.* And by him it got to be some where. Therefore by him it got to be. The minor is manifest by all that hath byn sayd in the former chapter. And the maior is euident by it selfe. For no company of men, much lesse a Catholike or vniuersall Church, can be, and be no where. And these 5. demonstrations which hitherto we haue made, haue byn taken out of the state wherein the protestants confesse their Church to haue byn before Luther arose.

The state of the protestant Church before Luther.

arose. For by them hath beene shewed, that before him according to the most true, most frequent, and most euident confessions of the famousest Protestants, it had no (a) Pastours to gouerne, no (b) sheep to be gouerned, no (c) appearance to be seene, no (d) place to abide, no (e) being to be. What then could it be but a fiction of lying men, or an imagination of phantike men, vainely deuised, vntruly auouched, and foundly beleeued.

(a) Cap. 8.
(b) Cap. 3.
(c) Cap. 5.
(d) Cap. 9.
(e) Cap. 2.

That all the Protestants first heard of, had beene in former tymes Papists.

CHAP. XI.

THe 6. demõstratiõ for to proue Luther to haue bin the Author of Protestãcie shall be grounded vpon that all Protestãts who were first heard of had bin al Papists before Luther began to teach. Of himselfe, thus writeth Luther Prefat. in tom. 1. *Before all things I request the godly reader, that he read all with indgement, and consider that I was once a monck, and a most madde Papist, when I began this cause; so drunken and drowned in Papistry, that I was most ready to kill all, if I had bin able, &c.* And in psalm. 45 tom. 2. fol. 441: *I was baptised in the Popes house, I was catechised, &c.* And in psalm. 51. fol. 57. *I wholy lined some trast of my lyfetime, as if any had then taught that which I now teach, I think I should haue torne him with my teeth.* And in cap. 1. Galat. tom. 5. fol. 101. 1. *If any at any time, surely I before the light of the gospell, did thinke priestly, and was zealous for Popish Lawes and traditions of Fathers, and did in great earnestnes vrge and defend them as holy, and the obseruation of them as necessary to saluation. I purely*

Luther before al Papists.

adored the Pope, and what soeuer I did, I did it of a simple heart, a good zeale, and to the glory of God. The authority of the Pope was so great with me, that I iudged it a crime worthy of eternall damnation to dissent from him; and would haue iuuenistred with fire and sword for the defence of the Popes authority.

Melanchon first a Papist.

2. Melancthon, who, as Caluin writeth, was a principall Minister of God in doing great matters, and was indeed Luthers chiefest instrument, in his dispute of Matrimony tom. 2. Luther. fol. vlt. giueth God thackes, that he was deliuered out of the kingdome of Antichrist and Popish errors; and sayth, as reporteth Scusselburg tom. 13. Catal. Hær. pag. 625. of himselfe: *I moued not these controuersies, but fell into them after they were moued, which being many and not explicated, I began to consider them with a desire of truth* And the Saxonicall Ministers in the Cöference of Alburg. Scrip. 7. pag. 349. write that Melancthon of his owne accord acknowledged himselfe a scholler of Luther, yea the whole Vniuersity of Witterberg, out of which almost al Luthers first champions came, was in former times Popish; as appeareth by their epistle ad Militium tom. 1. Lutheri fol. 205. where thus they write:

The Vniuersity of Wittemberg first Papist,

We are so affected both to all the Christian Religion and the sea Apostolike and holy Church of Rome, that if we were certaine, that D. Martin Luther were fallen into so foule and impious errours, we first of all would not only yield him vp to the law, but also would punish him and cast him out. And in their Epistle to Pope Leo 10. ibid. fol. 206. *Most holy Father we deuout and obedient children of your Holynes, do most humbly & earnestly beseech &c.* And below: *Neither would we euer seeme such, as would pertinaciously hold any opinion contrary to the Catholike doctrine, ready at all tymes to obey yours and the holy Churches behest in Christ.* And in another letter to Fredericke the Elector fol. 227. *Aboue all things we ex-*

cecding

exceedingly like that your highnesse simply and purely honoureth the holy Church and the Pope. Neither will we ever be of any other mind. We preferre nothing before the iudgment of the Roman Church. And not only the Vniuersity, but the people of VVittemberg were also Catholike, as Luther declareth in these wordes, to Fredericke Elector fol. 330. *It cannot be denyed that the Reformation of doctrine and religion in this Church (of VVittemberg) began by me.*

Frederike Elector first Catholike.

3. Fredericke also the Elector and Luthers chief Patron was a Papist. For thus himselfe writeth to Cardinall Raphael. tom. 1. Lutheri fol. 128. *Your kindnes God willing shall never see that I have any other mind or will then to shew my selfe obedient and officious vnto the Catholike Church.* And his Counsellers tom. 2. fol. 116. professe that he *is an obedient sonne of the Holy Catholike Church.* And likewise tom. 1. fol. 101. *Fredericke the Elector above all loueth the Catholike and Apostolike truth.* Besides (as Luther writeth tom. 7. sermone dessimulacris) he put siluer statuaes in the Church, thinking thereby to merit at Gods hands. And tom. 2. lib. de abroganda Missa fol. 268. *He deceased by Papists, did greatly increase and adorne the house of All Saints.* He founded also a Colledge of Canons, where he kept Masse vntill the end of the yeare 1524. as Chytreus testifieth lib. 11. histor. Saxon. and Luther intimateth in formula Missæ tom. 2. fol 387. saying. *Be not you or any other afraid, that in our VVittemberg that sacrilegious Topbet remayneth as yet, which is the wicked and lost many of the Princes of Saxony, I meane the temple of all Saints.*

Pomeranus.

4. Bugenlage the Pomeran and first Protestant of VVittemberge had beene before a Papist. For as Scultet. concione sæcul. pag. 15. reporteth when he first read Luthers booke de captiu. he sayd: *Since the beginning of the world the Sunne never beheld a greater heretike*

then Luther. Of Osiander thus writteth Danæus resp. Osiander. ponſ. ad Iconicum pag. 1518. *He was a moſt wicked Franciſcan Frier: His proper name was Hoſen, that is boſe or boſier, but of boſier he would be called Hoſius, that is a holy man.*

4. The ſame alſo we manifeſt of the Captains of the Sacramentaryes, among whom Zuinglius writeth thus of himſelfe epiſt. ad Fratres tom. 1. fol. 341. Zuinglius. *I will not deny, that in tymes paſt I receaued guiſts of the Pope. For then I thought it lawfull to vſe the Popes liberality, when I thought it a pious and godly matter to defend to my ſtrength his Religion and fayth.* And Luther lib. de Cœna writeth that Zuinglius *was become ſeauen tymes worſe, then when he maintayned Popish religion.* Likewiſe Oecolampadius Zuinglius his cheifeſt parener thus witneſſeth of Oecolampadius. himſelfe reſponſ. poſter. ad Porkeymerum pag. 108. *I entred into a Monaſtery being of a good age and a man of Doctor, and with mature aduiſe.* To which Hoſpin addeth part. 2. hiſt. fol. 35. *He entred two yeares before into the Monaſtery of our Sauiour neere to Auſpurge, and there became a Monke, fearing ſome danger of the common wealth by Luthers writings.* And ibidem fol. 42. he ſayth that Pellican Pelicanus. was a Franciſcan. And fol. 213. that Bucer became a Dominican in his childhood, of whome alſo and Bucer. Peter Martyr D. Andrewes Reſponſ. ad Apol Bellar. ſayth: *They left their monkiſh life.*

6. Of Caluin thus teſtifyeth himſelf lib de ſcandalis pag. 100. *Vnder the Popes tyranny I was free to marry, ſince God deliuered me from thence &c.* And reſponſ. ad Sadolet. pag. 122. *If I would haue prouided for my matters, I ſhould neuer haue left your faction.* In his Teſtament: *God deliuered vs from the deep darknes of Idolatry, wherein I was drowned.* And Pareus lib. 2. de amiſſ. grat. cap. 1. *VVhence were Luther and Caluin but of Papiſts?* The ſame appeareth out of his life written by Beza, where he ſayth

layth that he had a benefice in the Cathedral Church of Noyon, and the cure of a Parish thereby, and that he was first put in mind of Protestancy by Robert Oliuetan. That Peter Martyr was long tyme both Catholike and Canon regular, Simler testifyeth in his life, which also he affirmeth of Zanchius saying, that he was one of the 18. companiõs that forsaking Popery followed Peter Martyr, who also in his preface *de Natura Dei* layth that he was 35. yeares of age when he left Babylon. Peter Martyr. Zanchius.

7. Concerning the Lutherans in generall thus writeth Luther epist. ad Erford. fol. 500. *In which* (errour of Antichrist) *we being all stifled enthralled with a grieuous and miserable slauery, did serue the God and Prince of this world, seruing the same in sinnes and all kind of impiety.* And tom. 4. in cap. 43. Isaiæ fol. 179. *VVe are accounted heretikes of the Pope, as who haue deuided our selues from that Church wherein we were baptized and instructed.* In cap. 4. Galat. tom. 5. fol. 377. *VVe old men were brought vp in that* (Popish layth) *and haue so swallowed it, that it hath entred the most inward sinewes of our harts. And therefore we forget it with no lesse paynes, then we learne the true layth.* Ye heare how hardly the very first Protestants could become Protestants, & leaue to be Papists. And in cap. 11. Genes. tom. 6. fol. 129. he thus boasteth: *VVe are holy Apostates, for we haue fallen from Antichrist and the Church of Satan.* Melanchon likewise in cap. 7. Math. tom. 1. fol. 406. *VVe were heretofore subiect to the Popes kingdome.* Tom. 2. cont. Suencfeld pag. 200. *VVe departed from the Popes Churches.* Tom. 3. ad Art. Bauar. fol. 364. *There was necessary cause, that we should forsake the Papists.* And tom. 4. in Act. VVormat. pag. 403. *VVe haue iust cause of departure from the Popish congregation, and with good conscience we forsooke the consent of so many Nations.* Lutherãs in general

lames Andrewes cont. Hottum pag. 332. *The more aged doe gratefully acknowledge, that they came from you, that is, left you, and your doctrine.* And Schusselburg in Epist. dedicat. tom. 8. Catal. hæret. hath these wordes: *It is behooffull to haue before our eyes the causes wherein our consciences may in the stormes of temptations rely, why in this our age Ancestours would and ought to deuide themselues from the Roman Church.* Behold how their consciences were tossed as with a storme, for that they had forsaken the Roman Church. Lobechius also disput. 10. pag. 224. sayth; *Our Ancestours did well, that they went out of the Roman Babylon.*

Sacramentaryes in generall.

8. Of Sacramentaryes also in general thus writeth Zuinglius in Præfat. lib. de ver. & fals. relig. fol. 159. *We were alas long tyme so besieged with the inglings of men.* And Caluin in confess. Fidei pag. 111. *We dissemble not that we also were of the number of them (who honour Masses) vntill the abuses of Masse were discouered.* And 4. Instit. cap. 6. §. 6. *We departed from the Roman church.* cap. 15. §. 16. *We were christened in the Popes kingdome.* Respons. ad Versipel. pag. 360. *Of our owne accord we went from the table of Popery.* Resp. ad Sadolet. pag. 122: *That I may not make any long role, this I say, there was none of those who were beginners of this cause, but might haue beene in better estate and condition among you then that he needed therefore to thinke of any new kind of life.* Peter Martyr in locis col 1459. proposeth this question; *Whether the Ghospellers be Schismatikes, because they separated themselues from the Papists.* And col. 1465. concludeth thus: *Seeing there were so many and so iust causes of our departure from Popery, our separation seemeth to be very laudable & not to be disliked.* Zanchius tract de Eccles. cap. 18. *It is manifest that we departed from the Church or rather from the sect of the Pope. And this we willingly confesse.* Bullenger tom. 1. decad. 5.

serm.

serm. 2. fol. 282. *VVe willingly confesse that we went from the Roman Church.* Musculus in locis tit. de Schismate p. 620. *VVe are termed Apostates of the Romanists, as many haue forsaken the Communion of the Roman Church. This we are so farre from denying as we thinke that we should rather glory thereof.* Plessie de Eccles. cap 11. pag. 361. writeth that *Luther, Zuinglius, Oecolampadius, Bucer, Capito, Martyr* and others out of whose schoole sayth he the Ministers who gathered the Church from Antichrist did come were *Priests, Curats, Doctours of diuinity &c*, To whome Beza lib. de Notis pag. 8. adioyneth Pellican and Haller and others more, D. Whitaker lib. 9. cont. Duræum sayth: *Luther was a Priest according to your order, and such were Zuinglius, Bucer, Oecolampadius and others without number.* M. Perkins in cap. 4. Galat. v. 26: *All the first renewers of the Ghospell were either Priests or teachers of Schooles.* Paræus lib. cit: *Are we worthy of blame or heretikes because we left the Popes Church?* And in the end of his booke de Iustificatione: *Our Ancestours 97. yeares ago had necessary cause for to forsake Popery.* And Scultet. in concione sæculari pag. 4. *This is the hundreth yeare since God pluckt our Ancestors out of Popish darknes.* Finally Polanus in præfat. Thes. de Eccles: *VVe haue separated our selues from the false Catholike Synagogue.*

9. The same also is manifest of the English Protestants by their owne wordes. For thus they speake in their Apology part. 5. cap. 12. diuis. 1. *It is true we haue departed from them.* Item: *True it is we were brought vp with these men in darknesse and in the lacke of the knowledge of God.* And part. 6. cap. 20. diuis. 2. *As for vs truly we haue fallen from the Bishop of Rome.* Cassabon also Epist. ad Card. Peron cap. 16. *The king confesseth, that his church hath forsaken so few points of that sayth and discipline, which at this day the Roman Church doth professe.* And pag. English Protestats

17. *The English haue gone from that Church*, M. Hooker lib. 4. de Polit. Eccles. pag. 181. *We were a part of them.* M. Powel. lib. 1. de Antichristo cap 21. *We confesse we haue separated our selues from the Bishop of Rome, and his Synagogue.* M. Perkins in cap. 5. Galat. vers. 21. *We haue separated our selues from the Roman Church.* D. Whitaker cont. 2. quæst 6. cap. 3. sayth: *The Roman Church was iustly left of vs.* And D. Morton part. 2. Apol. lib. 2. cap. 10. *The former booke could a iust cause of our separation from you.* In like manner those of Zurich in Sleidan lib. 4. histor. say: *After the rising of the Gospell we haue cast of that burden which the Pope had put vpō vs idiots.* And adde withal that *before they had heard nothing of Protestancy.* And the Suitzers in their confess. cap. 17. confesse that their Churches had parted themselues from the Roman Church. And the Scots in their confess. write that *the truth was lately borne amongst them.* And the Polonians in their consent, that *God hath deliuered their Churches out of the grosse darcknes of Popery.*

Suitzers.

Polonians

10. Furthermore of the whole Protestant church or of Protestants in general, thus they write. Lobechius disp. 12. pag. 254. *Our confession* (of Ausburg) *was the beliefe of the whole orthodoxall Church gone out of Roman Babylon.* And in like sort speaketh Daneus de Antichristo cap. 17. Pareus Proæm. l. de Iustificat. *The Euangelicall Church was compelled aboue 96. yeares ago to make a diuision from the Popish Church*, The like he hath lib. 2. cap. 1. & lib. 3. cap. 8. Schusselburg tom. 8. catal. pag. 727. *Our Church departed from the Church of the malignant.* Polanus part. 2. Epist. ad Bezam. *The reformed Churches did well that they did separate themselues from the Popish Church.* Aretius in loc. part. 2. fol. 10. *Our reformed Churches departed from Popery.* D. Andrewes respons. ad Apoll. Bellarm. cap. 14. boasteth that *almost halfe of the Christian*

The whole Protest. Church.

Christian world is gone out of the Roman Babylon. And D. Whitaker cont. 2. quest. 3. cap. 3. sayth: *England, Germany, Scotland long ago haue fallen from the Pope.* And the English Apology glorieth in this sort, part. 1. cap. 1. diuis. 3. *For they be not all made at this day so many free cities so many Kings, so many Primats which haue fallen away from the seat of Rome.* Daneus cont. 4. lib. 4. cap. 12. *All Scotland, England, Saxony, Denmarke, a great part of Germany, all Switzerland, the greater part of the Grisons haue fallen from the Church of Rome.* D. Sutliue lib. 2. de Eccles. cap. 2. p. 251. *Our Church hauing shaken off the filth of the Roman church is returned to the Catholike sayth.* And pag. 254. *England, Scotland, Ireland, Denmarke, Nurwey, Saxony, Pomerania & the chiefest parts of Germany, France, Flandres, Poland haue fallen from the Pope.* Moalins lib. de fug. Arnoldi cap. 2. *Our Churches be called reformed, because they be Christian Churches purged from Popery.* D. Rainolds amongst his conclusions putteth this for the sixt: *That the reformed Churches in England, Scotland, France, Germany, and other kingdomes and Common wealths haue iustly separated themselues from the Roman.* And addeth with all that, *All reformed Churches haue departed from the Roman Church.* Brentius in his Apology for the confess. of Wittemberg pag. 873. speaking of Protestants sayth: *VVe also once were all fooles seduced and seducing and seruing idolatry and Antichrist.* Serauia defens. lib. de Grad. Minist. cap. 2. pag. 33. *I marke that the Authours of all Reformations which were made in our age were Priests of the Roman Church.* To al which I adioyne that Luther in cap. 2. Osee. tom. 4. fol. 279. sayth that these be the speeches of Papists. *VVere yee not Christians in the Popes Church? VVhy therfore go yee from her?* And he acknowledgeth that the Roman Church is their Mother, but sayth that they haue left her, because she is a harlot and an adulteresse.

Popish Church Mother of Protestants.

And Seranis de diuers. Minist. grad. cap. 6. pag. 30. hath these wordes: *The Roman Church is our Mother in which and by which God regenerated vs; but because she is a harlot and an adultresse, we iustly contest against her.* The like hath Ionius lib. singulari de Eccles. cap. 17. and others commonly. So that they acknowledge themselues to be the children of an harlot, and consequently bastardes, & not begotten of God, because God begetteth not children of harlots, but only of his chast spouse the Church. Let them therfore heare the Romã Church speaking to them in these words of S. Hierome: *If an Angel or Apostle haue rebaptised thee I breake not that which thou followest. But if thou borne in my lappe, nourished with the milke of my breasts, dost draw thy sword against me, restore what I gaue thee, and be if thou canst, a Christian by other meanes: I am a harlot but yet thy mother: I keep not chastity to one husband, such I was when thou wert begotten.* Or els let them harken to S. Athanasius: *It remayneth that they find fault with the baseneſſe of their flock, and say that they came not of pious, but of heretikes, neither feare they that which is written in the Prouerbs, An ill brood curseth their father.* Or else let them giue eare to S. Augustin thus speaking to the Manichees: *doe so slaues of Cham. Get you gon who despise the naked flesh whereof you sprung.* Againe: *Tea thou often maryed to elements or rather harlot prostitute to deuils and great with sacrilegious vanities dareſt thou reuile Catholike mariage of thy Lord with the crime of vnchastity.* But omitting this, because Protestants regard not, how farre they disgrace themselues, so that they reuile the Church of Rome; out of that which we haue rehearsed in this Chapter, it appeareth how impudently D. Morton 1. part Apol. lib. 1. cap. 10. wrote that Melancthon, Pellican, and others were Protestants before Luther arose, and much more impudently

Dial. cont. Lucif.

De Synod. Arim. & Seleuc.

L. 11. cont. Faust. c. 24 lib. 6. c. 5.

dently D. Feild layd lib. 3. de Eccles. cap. 8: that before Luthers time those who defended the Popish errors, were but some faction like to those in the Church of Corinth, who in S. Paules time denyed the Resurrection: which vntruth is so apparant, as to haue related it only, is to haue confuted it. But hereby the Reader seeth how needfull it is for me to heap vp many testimõies of Protestants, for to proue euen those things which are most manifest.

11. My sixt demonstration therfore I frame in this manner: *If all Protestants who were first knowne, whether people or perticuler persõs, were Papists before Luther began to preach, then were there no Protestants before him, and he author of their Church: But all the first knowne Protestants were such. Ergo.* The Maior is manifest by it selfe, & the Minor by that which hath bin recited in this chapter.

That no Protestant ancienter then Luther did come forth and adioyne himselfe to his company when Luther safely preached.

CHAP. XII.

THE seauenth demonstratiõ for to proue Luther to be the first Beginner of Protestancy, shall be taken from thence, that after that Luther securely preached Protestancy, no Protestant ancienter then he peeped out, and adioyned himselfe vnto him. This I proue: first out of the reall Confession of all Protestants, who neither then, nor hitherto could name one such Protestant. Whereupon it followeth necessarily, that Luthers company was altogether new,

new, & no one member thereof before him; neither did he adioyne those whome he drew out of Popery vnto any company before extant; neither did any company which had bin before, adioyne it selfe vnto him. Secondly this may be proued by the silence of D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 5. cap. 3. where being vrged with this argument, he answeareth it with silence only, and standeth mute, as confessing the accusation to be true. Thirdly I proue it by the silliness of the Answeares of other. Iunius lib. 4. de Eccles. cap. 5. sayth only, that some ancienter Protestants came forth, and adioyned themselues to Luther, but nameth none, nor proueth any thing; & therfore giueth words & nought else. He should, as Tertullian said to old heretikes, *haue feignes the names of some. For after blasphemy what may not they doe?* But I know not how it cometh to passe, that wheras Protestants feigne many things and persons, yet they dare not feigne names. As D. Sutline, when in the Preface of his book of the Church he had sayd only, that Bolsec (who wrote Caluins life) doth insinuate that he wrote for hire; after growing more bould in his answeare to exceptions cap. 4. pag 120 deuiseth a synode, in which (as he sayth) *Bolsec publikely recanted the book which he had written of Caluins life.* Of which Synode none before him ever heard, but since D. Morton and M. Beard write that they haue heard of it, perhaps by D. Sutliue, but yet durst not feigne the names either of the men who held this synode, or of the place where it was held, nor yet specifie the yeare of our Lord when it was held. This he left to others to feigne, or to himselfe at more leasure

Præscrip. c. 32.

D. Sutliue feigneth a Synod.

2. part. Apol. lib. 2. cap. 33. Beard Mosiur. 12.

2. Fourthly it may be proued by the ridiculous nomination and prouing made by some, D. Morton

part.

part. Apol. lib. 1. cap. 16. writeth that Melanchton, Pellican, Lambert, Capito, Oſiander, Saxmius, Bucer came forth, which he proueth because Alphonſe a Castro in the epiſtle dedicatory of his booke againſt hereſies hath theſe words; *Neither did Luther in this age come forth alone, but accompanied with a great troupe as with a guard*, and nameth thoſe before cited. But firſt it is ridiculous to ſay, that the foreſayd perſons were Proteſtants before Luther, ſith partly themſelues, partly Proteſtants deny it, as we ſhewed in the former chapter. Againe, it is ridiculous to proue this by Caſtroes teſtimony, who being a Spaniard, and thoſe all Germans except Lambert who was a French mā, it is moſt likely that he neuer knew thē nor heard of their names before Luther had reuolted. Moreouer ridiculous it is, to imagin that in the forecited words Caſtro ſhould ſay, that the fornamed perſons did come forth in ſuch ſort as we mean, that is, came out of the proteſtātes lurking holes, or to haue bin ſecret Proteſtāts before Luther appeared; ſeeing he only ſaith, that they came forth in ſuch ſort as he ſaith Luther came forth, to wit forth of the Catholik church & of Catholiks became hereticks.

3. Fiftly I proue it out of the common doctrine of Proteſtants, wherin they teach that euery one ought to adioyne himſelfe to the viſible Church if ſo he can conueniently. For ſo teacheth the Confeſſion of the low countryes art. 28. the French art. 26. Melancthon in cap. 8. Matth. Caluin 4. Inſtitut. cap. 1. D whitaker Cont. 2. queſt. 3 cap. 2 and others commonly. But theſe former Proteſtants (if any ſuch had bin) might conueniētly haue ioyned themſelues to Luthers cōpany after that they ſaw him to preach ſecurely and out of danger. Seeing therfore,

no

no such came to him, it is manifest that there were no such at all. Finally this is manifest otherwise. For suppose, that before Luther they lay so close, as that they worshipped God only in hart and soule, yet when they saw Protestancy to be preached publiquely and securely, and that they might liue openly and amongst men, who will imagine, that they would preferre darcknes before light, and lurking holes before townes and cities, and alwayes keep in deserts? Certaidly such kind of fellowes should be rather batts or owles, then men. Besides being iust men, forsooth, why did they not afford God externall worship whe they might securely doe it? Why did they not according to Christs commandement celebrate the memory of his Passion by receiuing of the Sacraments?

4. Out of these I compose the seauenth demonstration: *If after that Luther securely preached Protestancy, neuer any ancienter Protestant came forth and adioyned himselfe to his company, there were no Protestants before. But no such euer came forth. Ergo.* But if there were no Protestant before Luther, vndoubtedly he was the beginner of that company.

That the Protestant Church, and Religion is new.

CHAP. XIII.

THis eighth demonstration with which we will proue, that Luther was the beginner of the Protestant Church and religion, we will frame out of Protestants Confessions of the nouelty therof. First therefore

therfore they say, that in the iudgement almost of all men it is new, and that it is almost impossible, to wipe away from it the spot of nouelitie. Thus Illyricus in the Preface of his Catalogue: *VVhen Doctours rayſed of God preach the (Protestant) gospell and doe inueigh against contrary errors, they seeme in the iudgement almost of all men to bring a new doctrine vnheard of before and to impugne the old.* Againe: *It is very hard and almost impossible to remoue the hatefull marck of nouelty from the (Protestant) doctrine.* To which D. Fulke lib. de Succeſſ. pag. 454. addeth, that the Protestant religion, *VV as altogether new to most nations.*

Now in almost all mens iudgement.

Almost impossible.

2. Secondly in equiualent words they oftentymes call their Religion new or begun of new. For as we shal straight rehearse they terme it *In the bidde, renascent, reuiuing, borne a new, renewed, repayred, reſtored, rayſed againe, reſuſcitated.* And what can be meant by these termes, but a religion either new or newly erecteth, such as Christs religion is not? For neither is it new in it selfe, neither can it be begun or rayſed anew, because it can neuer fall. Luther in cap. 22. Genes. tom. fol. 208. writeth thus: *In the beginning of the gospell borne a new, Monetarius &c.* In cap. 31. fol. 434. *Nine assemblies haue beene held since the Ghospell began to be borne a new.* In cap. 32. fol. 458 *After the light of the Ghospell was borne againe.* In cap. 48. fol. 642. *At the beginning of the Ghospell rising againe.* In cap. 49. fol. 682. *They desire to extinguish the light of the Ghospell rising againe.* In cap. fol. 342. *I remember that before these tymes of the Ghospell borne a new.* And in the Præfat. Deuter. tom. 3. Ienen. fol. 75. *The rising againe or rather springing Ghospell.* Thus speaketh Luther. Melanct. hon Apol. pro Luthero tom. 2. Luthers fol. 194. *You oppose against the rising light of the Ghospell.* And respond. ad Clerum Colon. tom. 2. pag. 97.

Borne a-new.

Rising a-gaine.

The

renewed. *The beginning of the pure doctrine rising againe.* And in cap. 7 Matth. tom. 1. fol 398: He termeth it *renewed doctrine.* Carion in Chron. pag. 706. calleth their Church *the renascent Church.* Iustus Ionas Epist. dedicat. lib. Lutheri de Iudæis tom. 7. fol. 166. *God would that in our time the Gospel should be borne againe vnder the house of Saxony.*

reuiuing. Besoldus in his Preface of the 4. part of Luthers Cometarie vpon Genes. hath these words: *In the beginning of the Church borne anew.* Osiander in his Manual englished pag. 62: *Our doctrine is renewed.* And his sonne Lucas Epist. Euchar: *The doctrine of the gospel borne againe.*

Christianity greene, The author of the Sponge in Daneus pag. 13. calleth it *the light of the Ghospell borne againe, the Euangelicall doctrin reuiuing or quickning againe.* Kemnice in locis part. 2. p. 106. *In the beginning of the Ghospell borne againe.* Amongst the Sacramentaryes Zuinglius speaketh thus in supplicat. ad Suithenses fol 121: *Christianity being greene, christianity rising againe.* And in Eccles. fol. 41. *New born truth.* Which phrase he repeateth disput. tom. 2. fol. 607. Gesperus in Bibliotheca sayth of Luther: *The new borne Church doth owe much vnto him.* Muscle Epist.

Recalled Ghospell. dedicat. locorum. *I was in the beginning of the new rising Euangelicall truth.* Bucer in Retract. pag. 642. vseth

beginning of the new born Ghospell. these words: *Among the Ministers of the recalled Ghospell.* Beza in cap 2. Rom. v. 20. *They by whose Ministery God in our age hath recalled to light Christs Ghospell almost buryed.* Gualter. Præfat. in Rom. *How much harme the Anabaptists did at the beginning of the new borne Ghospell.* Martyr in

Quickning againe. locis tom. 2. pag. 228. *In the beginning of the Ghospell borne againe.* And in Epist. dedicat. comment. ad Rom. *The Ghospell quickning againe.* Hospin. Epist. dedicat. 1. part. histor. *The Euangelicall truth borne againe.* Sobinus in Methodo Theol. pag. 215. *Among the Doctours of the Church borne againe.* And Caluin 4. Institut. cap. 7. §.

24. The

24. *The doctrine of the Ghospell borne againe.* lib. de scand. pag. 78. & 94. *The ghospell borne againe.* Admonit. 2. ad Westphalum pag. 784. *The Ghospell is borne againe.* And cont. Seruetum pag. 592: *Of the Ghospell borne againe.* And in like manner he speaketh ordinarily. Sadel respo. ad Arthurum cap. 7. *The Church borne againe.* Paræus in Miscellan. Vrsini pag. 26. *The light of the Ghospell borne againe.* Danæus responl. ad Solnec. pag. 1565: *In the very beginning of the Ghospell borne againe.* Plessie de Eccles. cap. 11: *Christ borne againe.* Cambden in apparatu Annalium: *The rising religion of Protestants.* Vsher de Success. cap. 8. *In the beginning of the Ghospell born againe.* Sculr. in Præfat. 4. partis Medullæ: *Then were in the floure of the Church borne againe.* Moreouer Luther tom. 1. in dis. fol. 410. calleth his doctrine, *A doctrine repayred in this age.* And Præfat. ad Galat. tom. 5. fol. 270. sayth: *In these later tymes the holesome knowledge of Christ was againe resuscitated* Iames Andrewes lib. cont. Hosium pag. 1 *The Lord by the Ministery of Luther hath resuscitated the doctrine of the Ghospell.* And pag. 349: *Among our men after the doctrine of the Ghospell was resuscitated.* Kēnice Præfat. in lib. de vnione hypostat: *It is now three score yeares since the ancient serpent raised againe the heresy of Berengarius for to oppresse as they say in the blade the doctrine of the Ghospell then first restored by Luthers Ministery.* Caluin l. de Cœna cap. 10: *This controuersie began betweene them, who were the chiefest captaines in restoring the doctrine of the ghospell, and bringing it backe as it were when it was lost.* Lib. de libero arbit. pag. 147. *The purity of the Ghospell was restored by Luthers labour especially.* Et epist. ad Ducem Somersleti: *God would haue me to be one of those by whose labour he restored this tyme the sincere doctrine of the Ghospell.* Danæus in method. scripturæ pag. 400: *There are 54. yeats past since that tyme that the pure light and doctrine of the Ghos-*

Christ borne againe.

In the floure of the Church.

repaired.

Resuscitated.

Ghospell in the blade.

Restored.

pell was first restored to the world. Apol. Eccles. Angl. part. pag. 64. *It is no new thing though at this day the religion of Christ be entertained with despits and checks being but lately restored and as it were comming vp againe a new.* Ibid. cap. 17. *Our desire was to haue the temple of the Lord restored a new.* Iezier de bello Euchar. fol. 72: *Euen from the beginning of the restored Euangelicall light.* M. Bancroft in his Survey cap. 8. *In this later age of the world it hath pleased God to restore vs the light of the Ghospell.* And M. Alenson in præt. contro. 4. Whitakeri: *After the restauration of the Ghospell.* And many more (as we see in the chapter following) call their ghospell *restored Religion*. By which it may appeare that D. Andrewes Respons. ad Apol. Bellarm. cap. 1. did vntruly deny, that their men call their fayth a *restored fayth*. But whiles he denyeth that their men termeth it so, he clearely sheweth, what those meane who terme it so, to wit, that they meane *a religion borne or framed a new*, according to the very substance thereof. And in truth what els could they meane by so many termes and so often repeated *of a religion greene in the blade, borne againe, rising againe, resuscitated, renewing, reuiuing, recalled, repaired, brought backe againe, restored*, but a religion substantiall produced, instituted and founded a new.

3. Thirdly this is proued, because they write, that in the tyme of Luther, of Melanchon, of Zuinglius, of the Anabaptists and such others, was *the beginning, the very beginning, the first beginning, the origtnall, the entrance, the cradle, the dawning, the new rising* of their Church and religion, as appeareth in the aforesayd testimonies of Luther, Melanchon, Besoldus, Kemnicius, Musculus, Gualter, Peter Martyr, Danæus, Vsserius, Gezler. And besides, Luther in cap. 3. Genes. tom. 6. fol. 33. hath these words: *In the beginning*

of

of the Ghospell, Carolostadius &c. Georgius Fabritius lib. 1. Orig. Saxon. pag. 13. *God would that true and holesome doctrine should have her beginning in the vniuersity of VVittemberg.* Caluin epist. ad Montisbelgardenses col. 590. edit. 1617: *In this our age the ghospel did slow out of the church of VVittemberg.* Brentius Præfat. lib. Andreæ contra Hosium: *Did not we all in the beginning of the renealed ghospell with one mouth disproue your Popish impieties?* And in Recognit. pag. 327: *They cannot deny, that, euen from the beginning of the reborne ghospell, the Zuinglians &c.* And l. de Matest. Christi pag. 109: *Euen from the beginning of the renealed ghospell, Melanchton &c.* Wittebergenses in Resut. Orthodoxi consensu. pag. 22. *Luther recited some things which in the beginning of the reborne doctrine of the ghospell he vaunted to the Papists.* Lobechius disput. 12. *Straight after the beginning of the shining truth, in the yeare 1520. &c.* Pappus defens. 1 cont. Sturmium pag. 19. *Then sayest that there were no such Theses published since the beginning of religion. I shew thee the contrary that Luther and Philip held the same.* Sleidan prefat. histor: *The beginning (of Protestancy) was slender and almost contemptible, and one only (Luther) bare the brunt of all the world.* Zanchius lib. de persecut. 192: *In the beginning of the Ghospell the sect of Anabaptists arose.* Caluin epist. 63 *If in the first beginning of the church, rising againe, this example of tyranny doth now peep, what will it shortly?* And epist. 178: *In the beginning of the ghospell borne againe.* Epist. 269. *The beginnings of the kingdome of Christ euery where in our ages were almost base and contemptible.* Resposs. ad Sadolet p. 133: *After the new rising of the ghospell.* Plessie de Eccles. cap. 11. *VVhat shall we thinke that the new Starre anno (1572.) did signify but the new birth of Christ on earth by preaching of the word.* And he addeth, that as Christ first borne put the Idols oracles to silence, so borne againe he hath made the Popish mi-

Protestancy had its beginning in Wittenberg.

Anabaptists in the beginning of Protestantisme.

New ryssing.

New birth.

racles to vanish. Scultete part. 1. Medullæ in Irenæo cap. 9. *In this age the dawning of the Euangelicall truth hath shined a new vnto vs.* Zuinglius lib. de Prouid. tom. 2. fol 352: *The Lantgrane laboureth that the infancy of Religion be piously nourished.* And Gesner in Bibliotheca sayth: *Luther did happily set forward the infancy of Religion.* The Apology of the Church of England part. 2. c. 2. diuis. 1. writeth, that Anabaptists, and Libertynes *haue beene stirring in the world euer since the ghospell did first spring.* M. Powel de Antichristo c. 32. *How many wars haue beene since the light of the ghospell arose, the Heluetian, the Protestant warre &c.* Villerius l. de Succes. Eccl. c. 8. *At the beginning of the ghospell burne againe, Thomas Bilney &c.* M. Bale cent. 8. cap. 68. speaking of the beginning of protestancy, calleth it, *The rising of the new Hierusalem.* Horne in his harbour, *The second birth of Christ.* And Brocard in cap. 2. Apocal: *the second comming of Christ.* *But surely if the yeare 1520. were straight after the beginning of Protestancy: If Luther, Melanchton, Zuinglius, the Anabaptists, and such like were from the beginning, at the beginning, and straight after the Rising of Protestancy: If the dissention amongst Protestants, were in the first beginning of their Church: If finally Protestant doctrine had its beginning in the Church of VVittemberge & flowed from thence,* without doubt it is a new doctrine and Church, which either had neuer been before, or was newly founded and restored. Besides what other thing can signify *The new rising, the new birth, the second comming of Christ,* but another substantiall beginning and repayring of Christs religion and Church after it had been quit ouerthrowne. The same also the Sectaries insinuate, when they say, that the light of the ghospell was in their tyme new kindled, or lightned againe. Luther tom. 2. fol. 305. alias 307. *God in these last tyme hath kindled againe the light of the ghospell.* And in

The dawning.

The infancy.

Second birth.

Second comming

Kindled againe.

cap.

cap. 17. Genes. tom. 6. fol. 210. *He hath kindled againe for vs the light of the Ghospell.* Melancthon in cap. 11. Dan. tom. 2. fol. 314. *God hath againe kindled for vs the light of the ghospell*, which againe he repeateth in his common places tit. de gratia. The same hath Vitus Theodorus Præfat. Comment. Luth. in Psalm. Kemnitius in locis tit. de Iustificat. pag. 109. 247. The Elector in Edicto de lib. concord. & Zuinglius Præfat. Elench. tom. 2. fol. 5. sayth: *Christ hath lighted againe in our tyme the lanterne of his word.* Wherefore falsly doth Boysseul in confutat. Spondæi pag. 25. deny, that their men say they kindle anew the doctrine of saluation. But (as before I sayd of D. Andrewes) Boysseul by denying that their men say they kindle againe the doctrin sheweth vs, that those who indeed say so, do meane of a substantiall production of light, as in truth the word kindling doth signify.

4. Fourthly I proue the nouelty of the Protestant Church and religion, because they doe sometymes in plaine termes call it *new, fresh, vnused, vnaccustomed newly planted, altogether new, and newly erected.* Luther Præfat. formulæ Missæ tom. 2. fol. 384. *I was alwayes slow and fearefull for the weaklings in sayth, from whome could not suddenly be taken so old and inured, nor in a sudden so fresh & vnaccustomed manner of serving God.* In psalm. 45. tom. 3. fol. 439. he sayth: *Neither was there euer any new worde revealed without miracles.* Which after he had proued by the example of Abraham, Moyses and Christ, he addeth: *So we also haue our Miracles.* And in cap. 19. Gen. tom. 6. fol. 238. he sayth, that Papists do sore vrge med. them saying: *Your doctrine is new and vnknowne to our forefathers*, which he answering, denyeth not that his doctrine is new, but rather granteth it, saying: *What belongeth it to vs what God hath iudged of those who dyed heretofore.*

Fresh and vnaccusto-

tofore. Now the word is preached vnto vs, we must not be inquirers who aske God why he hath reuealed his doctrine at this tyme and not in former ages. And in cap. 12. fol. 148. he writeth in these words: *Here surely Abraham doth shew no small trouble of conscience which euen in his banishment is wounded with this dart, to thinke in this sort: Looke to it, Thou art all one a stranger, where soeuer thou goest thou carryest with thee a new and strange religion. Art thou alone holy? hath God care of thee only, and hath he cast off so many people and nations?* I beleue (sayth Luther) *we also suffer when our aduersaryes with open mouth demand of vs, Are all who went before vs, and followed the Popes religion damned?* Yee see how plainly he intimateth his trouble of conscience about the newnesse and strangenes of his religion. And in Appendice confess. in Hospin. part. 2. fol. 188. he sayth: *Because our doctrine seemed at that tyme very new and wonderfull scandalous to the whole world, it behoued vs to deale modestly.* And in the Epitaphe of his tombe is engrauen this verse:

Seemed very new to the whole world.

A new light of the Ghospell he spred throughout the world.

Melanct hon Præfat. in tom. 2. Luther i thus speaketh of him: *He did so illustrate these writings, that after a long & darcke night there seemed to the iudgment of all pious and prudent men to arise a new light of doctrine.* The vniuersity of Wittemberg in Sentent. de Missa in Luthero tom. 2. fol. 349. writeth that the abolishing of priuate Communion: *Is in this tyme a thing altogether new*, As Luther ibidem fol 385. sayth that Communion vnder both kinds, *is a rite euer new*. Spalatine whome Protestants account a very graue man in his relation of the Confession of Auspurg sayth: *Such a confession was neuer made not only a thousand yeares agoe, but not since the beginning of the world, neither in any history nor in any ancient Father or Doctor is such a Confession to be heard of.* Huber in Antibellarminum

New in the iudgment of al wise men.

Neuer such a confession.

minum libro 4. capite. 3. *Our Church hath a new forme not vsed at that tyme when the Pope had all.* Wittembergenses in Prefat: Refutat. Orthodoxi Consensus call the Protestant Church lately planted, and as yet tender. George Fabritius libro 7. Orig. Saxon. pag. 858. speaking of protestancy sayth: *Duke George was greatly against this new doctrine, who was deceiued by the ancienter vse of his forefathers.* And lib. 8 pag. 21. writeth that euen the Prince Electour himselfe at the first did not much defend Luthers reformatiõ *as being new*. And Freschelius Archdeacon of Wittemberg Preface in Comment Melancthonis in Math. calleth the Protestants company according to the age therof *a Childish camp*. In like sort doe the Sacramentaries speake, for thus Zuinglius Pareneſi ad ciuitatem Suithensem tom. 1. fol. 110. *First of all in humble manner we entreat this, that our cause doe not seeme to you absurd by reason of the newnesse therof.* And in Supplicat. ad Suithenses he doth almost openly confesse that *he goeth about to ginc men new precepts and lawes.* And those of Zurich in Sleidan lib. 4. write that *their ministers doe teach them now fiue yeares, and that at the begining this kind of doctrine seemed new, because they had neuer heard any such thing before.* Sadeel de vocat. pag. 543: *God hath brought into light the reborne Church as a yonglng*, and pag. 555. that he hath *layd a new foundation of the Church, and erected againe the Church.* Caluin Respons. ad Sadolet pag. 131. maketh a man speake thus to God in defence of his becomming a Protestant: *I being offended at the nouelty, did hardly giue eare vnto it.* Bastingius epist. dedicat. Catechis: *It seemed good to God in our time to erect his Church a new.* Beza in Confess cap. 4 sect. 49: *God would preserue the reliques of his Church in Poperie till he had erected it againe.* The Apologie of the English Church part. 4. cap. 4. Diuis. 21

Lately planted.

New doctrine.

A childish campe.

Seemed new.

A new foundation.

Erected a new.

Erected againe.

Forty yeares agoe and vpward it was an easy thing for them to deuise against vs those accursed speeches and others too, when in the midst of the darknesse of that age it first began to spring and to giue shine some one glimmering beame of truth vnknowne at that time and vnheard of, when as yet the thing was but new & the successe thereof vncertaine, and when there could be imagined against vs no fact so detestable but that the people then would soon beleiue it for the nouelty and straungenesse of the matter. Ibid. diuis. 1: *How often haue they set on fire Princes houses to the end they might quench the light of the gospell in the very first appearing of it.* M. Fox in his Acts set forth anno 1610. pag 788. writing what passed anno 1523 speaketh thus: *Then the doctrine of Luther first beginning to spring and being but in the blade, was not yet knowne whereto it tended, nor to what it would grow.* D. Rainolds in his Conference cap. 5. sect. 2. sayth that Protestants *haue not had long tract of time.* And a late Chronicler, thought to be M. Goodwin writing the life of K. Henry. 8. 1521. sayth: *In the meane time our king moued at the nouelty of Luthers doctrine* &c. To all which I adde, that Erasmus (whome Protestants as is before shewed doe challenge as one of theirs) writeth thus to the Brethren of the low coūtreis: *do not they bring a new Gospel, who expound it otherwise then the Church hitherto hath done?* But Why I pray you should the Protestants religion seeme new to all the world, and in the iudgement of all pious and prudent men, if indeed it were not new? How should so many, so famous Protestants, so often, and in so many different kinds of writings, to wit in prose, in verse, in peaceable, in contentious writings, in Historicall, in dogmaticall, in speech to men & to God himselfe haue sayd so plainly and so many wayes, that Protestant religion was *new, fresh, vnwonted, vnused, wholy new, newly planted, & erected*

But in the blade.

New Ghospell.

erected anew if they had not thought that it was indeed new. For as Luther sayth: *It is impossible but that the conscience will some time bewray it selfe.*

5. If any aske of vs that the fore layd Protestants doe not meane, that their religion was absolutely new. First I aske, why then doe they absolutely say so, and that so often and in so many kind of writings? Why do they so often and in so weighty a matter write otherwise then they think? Besides, it cannot be proued, that they did not meane that it was absolutely new when they spake so, otherwise then because perhappes at other times they sayd the contrary. Which kind of proofe in Heretikes is friuolous, as partly hath bin shewed before, partly shall be more hereafter. Moreouer this is like the excuse of the Marcionists, who whē they had brought in a new God, yet would not haue him to be called absolutely new, but *only newly knowne or discouered.* Protestats first refuted.

6. Fistly I proue the nouelty of Protestant religion because euen then when in words they deny it to be new, in very deed they confesse it to be new in such sort as sufficeth for me to proue that Luther was the Author therof, and that it is not the religion of Christ, to wit, that it is of new erected, built & set vp according to the very substance and essence therof in such sort as a house falle downe but newly raised in walls, roofe and other such substantiall parts may be called a new house; Because Christs Church and religion cannot be new in this sort, being such as can neuer fall. For they confesse, that the antiquity of their Church was abrogated, and that it is a religion refined and reformed, and that they are refiners and reformers. D. Morton 1. part. Apol. lib 3. cap 1. writeth that Protestants Chal-

lenge the first antiquity, but abrogated by mens fault. Tunius Cont. 4. lib. 4. cap. 7 sayth: *The continuance of the old and Catholike doctrine is renewed.* But surely that thing whose antiquity hath bin abrogated and broken of, is new. For the kingdome in Cæsars time was new in Rome although it began with the citty it selfe, because it had bin abrogated for diuers ages. Wherupon Riuet Epitom. Cont. tract. 3 cap. 21 sayth: *Things are called new, when they are renewed and vsed after interruption.* Besides whether a thing once abrogated and taken away and afterward restored be to be called new or no, it sufficeth to me, that the Protestant religion is in such sort new, as a house fallen downe and newly raised may be called new: because the Church & religion of Christ cannot be new in this manner, nor the antiquity ther of, abrogated, and cut of. In like sort Muscle in locis tit. de noua doctrina pag. 417: Albeit he deny that they make new doctrine yet he confesseth that they renew doctrine, And that he meaneth of a substantiall renouation wherin the very substance of a thing is renewed, it appeareth by the precedent page where he sayth that *old matters abrogated & fallen down for some ages are renewed.* A Church therfore and religion fallen downe they doe renew, that is, erect a new. Wherupon the French Confession, Beza, & Bastingius as is before recited say that their Church *is againe, & a new erected,* and others cal her a Church *Reuiued, resuscitated, reborn* and assigne a new birth and begining of her, which words doe manifestly signifie a new substantial production or making of her: which whether it be called a nouatiõ or renouatiõ, maketh not much to the purpose, seing it is either a substantial production or first making of that which neuer had bin before, or

a re-

a reproduction and second making of that, which though it had bin before, yet was fallen, and the substance therof corrupted and perished. Of which nouation or renouation Luther was the Author, Besides they call themselues *Renewers or Refiners*, and their Church or religion *Reformed or refined*. D. Andrewes Respons. ad Apol. Bellarm. cap. 1: *VVe are Renewers. VVe call our religion reformed*. Caluin Epist. 341: *VVe carry the name of the reformed Church*. Iunius lib. 4. de Eccles. cap. 16: *VVe hold the Reformed Christian faith*. And in the same sort speaketh the Scots Confession, the Consent of Poland, D Whitaker Prefat. cont. & cont. 1. quest. 2. c. 16. & 17. & cont. 2. quest. 5. c. 2. & others commonly. I aske therfore what kind of forme of religion haue they taken away by their reformation, and what a one haue they giuen? Surely they haue changed the very substantiall forme. For (to omit al other points) they haue taken away the former manner of obtayning remission of sinnes by the Catholike faith and good workes, and brought in a new of obtayning the same by special faith only, and vndoubtedly the way to obtaine remissiō of sins, is substantiall toa Church and religiō. But they who take away the substantiall forme and bring a new, doe make a new thing, and such a mutation ought rather to be termed a formation, then reformation. But whether it be called a formation or reformation, it skilleth little, it sufficeth (as I sayd) that it is a substantiall mutation of religion, the Author whereof Luther was, and such a mutation, as cannot happen to the religion and Church of Christ. Moreouer, it is the shift of old and new heretiques to bring in new religions vnder the name of Reformation. Of the Marcionists thus writeth Tertullian: *They say that Marcion*

Protestants call themselues reformers.

lenge the first antiquity, but abrogated by meins foule. Iunius Cont. 4. lib. 4. cap. 7 sayth: *The continuance of the old and Catholike doctrine is renewed.* But surely that thing whose antiquity hath bin abrogated and broken of, is new. For the kingdome in Cæsars time was new in Rome although it began with the citty it selfe, because it had bin abrogated for diuers ages. Wherupon Riuet Epitom. Cont. tract. 3 cap. 21 sayth: *Things are called new, when they are renewed and vsed after interruption.* Besides whether a thing once abrogated and taken away and afterward restored be to be called new or no, it sufficeth to me, that the Protestant religion is in such sort new, as a house fallen downe and newly raised may be called new: because the Church & religion of Christ cannot be new in this manner, nor the antiquity therof, abrogated, and cut of. In like sort Muscle in locis tit. de noua doctrina pag. 417: Albeit he deny that they make new doctrine yet he confesseth that they renew doctrine, And that he meaneth of a substantiall renouation wherin the very substance of a thing is renewed, it appeareth by the precedent page where he sayth that *old matters abrogated & fallen down for some age; are renewed.* A Church therfore and religion fallen downe they doe renew, that is, erect a new. Wherupon the French Confession, Beza, & Bastingius as is before recited say that their Church *is againe, & a new erected,* and others cal her a Church *Reuiued, resuscitated, reborn* and assigne a new birth and begining of her, which words doe manifestly signifie a new substantial production or making of her: which whether it be called a nouatiō or renouatiō, maketh not much to the purpose, seing it is either a substantial production or first making of that which neuer had bin before, or

a re-

a reproduction and second making of that, which though it had bin before, yet was fallen, and the substance therof corrupted and perished. Of which renouation or renouation Luther was the Author, Besides they call themselues *Renewers or Refiners*, and their Church or religion *Reformed or refined*. D. Andrewes Respons. ad Apol. Bellarm. cap. 1: *VVe are Renewers. VVe call our religion reformed*. Caluin Epist. 341: *VVe carry the name of the reformed Church*. Iunius lib. 4. de Eccles. cap. 16: *VVe hold the Reformed Christian faith*. And in the same sort speaketh the Scots Confession, the Consent of Poland, D Whitaker Prefat. cont. & cont. 1. quest. 2. c. 16. & 17. & cont. 2. quest. 5. c. 2. & others commonly. I aske therfore what kind of forme of religion haue they taken away by their reformation, and what a one haue they giuen? Surely they haue changed the very substantiall forme. For (to omit al other points) they haue taken away the former manner of obtayning remission of sinnes by the Catholike faith and good workes, and brought in a new of obtayning the same by special faith only, and vndoubtedly the way to obtaine remissiō of sins, is substantiall toa Church and religiō. But they who take away the substantiall forme and bring a new, doe make a new thing, and such a mutation ought rather to be termed a formation, then reformation. But whether it be called a formation or reformation, it skilleth little, it sufficeth (as I sayd) that it is a substantiall mutation of religion, the Author whereof Luther was, and such a mutation, as cannot happen to the religion and Church of Christ. Moreouer, it is the shift of old and new heretiques to bring in new religions vnder the name of Reformation. Of the Marcionists thus writeth Tertullian: *They say that Marcion*

Protestants call themselues reformers.

Marcion did not so much innouate the rule (or faith) as reforme that which heretofore was corrupted. And he himselfe after he was become a Montanist: *This is shewed of vs, that the discipline of Monogamie is neither new nor strange, yea both ancient and proper to Christians, that now may think the Paraclete (Montanus) to haue bin rather the Restorer then beginner therof.* And of Seruetus thus write those of Zurick in Caluin cont Seruet. pag. 626. *He goeth on to thrust vpon the Church a most corrupt doctrine vnder the shew of restitution of Christianity.*

L. 1. cont. Mar. c. 10.

L. 1. de Monogam. fin.

7. Sixtly, because the Protestants designe the place, the occasion, the yeare, day, and hower, when Protestancie began: The place we haue heard already out of Caluin and Fabritius was Wittemberg, & the same doth Luther insinuate in cap. 49. Isaiæ tom. 4. fol. 192 saying: *Now Wittenberg is blasphemed as the fountaine of all heresies, but it will come to passe some yeares hence that it shall be praised of Posterity, as Gods garden from whence the Gospell was propagated into Germanie and all parts of the world.* And Mathew Iudex in Edicto æterni dei: *That clamour against Antichrist came out of the durty townes of barbarous and base Germany.* A fit place no doubt from whence so durty, filthy, and barbarous an heresy should spring. For sooth Wittemberge is the Protestants Syon, from whence their law should come. S. Austin thought it ridiculous madnesse, that the Donatists should say that the Church was to be renewed out of Africa the third part of the world, & shall we think it wisedom to imagin that it should be renewed out of a durty and barbarous corner of Duchland? The occasion of it was Tezelius his preaching of Indulgences, for thus writteth Crusius l. 10. Anal. Sueu. pag. 578. *Tezelius boldnesse stirred vp Luthers mind to set vp conclusions against those indulgences on the gates of the temple of*

the place where protestancy began.

protestancy began in a durty corne of barbarous coū-

l. vnit. c.

the occasion of the beginning protestancy.

All

Saints in Wittemberg the last day of October which was Saturday. Hence now came the occasion & beginning (sayth he) of correcting the christian religion. Schusselburg Præf. tom. 8. Catal. hæret: *Old men remember & is recorded in writing for remembrance for euer and publiquely extant, that this was the cause that the Gospell flourished againe in our age, that Iohn Tetzele carryed about pardons of sinnes to be sold in the Popes name.* And Kemnice 4. part. Exam. tit. de Indulgentijs pag. 78: *It is knowne to all the world, that the impudent, and impious sale of pardons aboue 50. yeares ago gaue entrance to the holesome repurging of heauenly doctrine.* And Manlius in Calendario: *On All Saints eue first of all conclusions against Indulgences were fastned by Luther vpon the gate of the Church of Wittemberg castle in the yeare 1517. at twelue of the clocke.* The same say Melancthon in Præfat. in tom. 2. Lutheri, Sleidan, Carion, and others. We haue then the place where, to wit, Wittemberg, the yeare 1517. the day of the month, the last of October, the day of the weeke, Saturday, and finally the very houre, to wit, twelue of the clocke, when first Protestancy began to arise. And as Vincent. Lyrin. sayth: *What heresy e-uer was there which sprung not vp vnder some certaine name in a certaine place, and tyme.* Cap. 34.

The day of the weeke & month.

The yeare & houre.

8. Seauenthly I proue the nouelty of Protestancy by the mutual testimony of the Lutherans against the Sacramentaries, and of the Sacramentaries against the Lutherans. For of the Sacramentaries doctrine thus testifieth Luther in defens. verborū Cœnæ tom. 7 fol. 381. *Neither doth any thing set forth this heresie more then nouelrie.* And tom. 2. Zuinglij fol. 383. *Carolstadius first raised his errour.* Melancthon Epist. ad Micronium, calleth it *new doctrine*, and addeth that *Carolstadius first raised this tumult.* Hethusius lib. de reali præsentia fol. 2: *Carolstadius the vnhappy author of this dis-*

Luthera- say that the Sacra doctrine is new.

cord

1672
1517

cord. Kemnice in fundamentis Cœnæ pag. 1162. *Carolstadius was the first author of this strife.* And Hospin. part. 2. Histor. fol. 68. writeth that Melanchon impugned the Sacramentaries doctrine *as a thing altogether new*, and fol. 46. that Pomeran *disallowed Zuinglius doctrine as a noueltie*. And in Nartat. dissipatæ Eccles. Belg. pag. 179. The Lutherans say to the Caluinists, *your doctrine is new*: and pag. 213. *your doctrine is of late*. And Confes. Mansfeld: *The Sacramentary doctrin is iustly suspected of vs. First for the nouelty therof because it arose in our tyme.* Neither ought the Sacramentaries to accept against these testimõies, as if they were the testimonies of the aduersaries. For such aduersaries they are as themselues account them their brethren in Christ, and members of the same Church. Besides, though themselues be aduersaries both to Catholiks and Lutherans, nevertheless they will haue their testimonies to be take against thẽ in matters of fact. Moreouer, because the Sacramentaries themselues doe sometime confesse the same. For Zuinglius tom. 2. Respons. ad Struthionem fol. 303. calleth Carolstadius: *The first teather of the truth of the Eucharist.* And in Subsidio fol. 244. he calleth his opinion, *the exposition of the ancients brought back as it were after it was lost.* Lasco Epist. ad Reg. Poloniæ, *abolished by iniury of times and restored as it were after it was lost.* Lauather de dissidio Euchar. fol. 2. writeth that the Senate of Zurich *VV as troubled which the newnesse of the matter.* And fol. 5. that when Occolampade had set forth his booke, *the Senate of Basle moued with the nouelty of the matter, forbid his booke to be sold, vntill it had bin examined by Censors.* And fol. 1. that Zuinglius opiniõ *was not heard of by the common people.* In like sort the Sacramentaries write of the proper opinions of the Lutherans. For of their impanation

panation or mixture of Christs body and bread in the Eucharist Caluin Defens. 2. cont Westphalum pag. 786. sayth: *It is a new doctrine, and till now vnheard of, that bread is substantially the body of Christ.* Oecolampadius responsione poster. ad Perkeymer pag. 18. *Those new Doctours graunt to bread that it is substantially the body of Christ.* And of the Lutherans vbiquity, wherwith they make Christs body to be euery whet, Caluin pronounceth Admonit. vlt. ad Westphalum pag. 829. *that it was not borne long since.* And Alesius apud Hospin part. 2. fol. 201. sayth: *I know both the tyme when this opinion was first broached to the Church, and who was Author thereof.* Authores Admonit. de lib. concord. cap. 3. pag 95. *No men taught this their opinion before Luther. Do they not bring forth new deuises and not heard of before in the Church?* Beza also lib. de Omnipræsentia carnis Christi pag. 509. calleth it *a doctrine vnheard of in the Church.* Finally Clenuitius apud Hesshus. lib. cit. calleth the very Confession of Auspurg, *A new and fifth Ghospell.* Thus Protestants testify the newnesse of each other doctrine.

Sacramentaryes say the Lutheran opinions are new.

9. Eightly I proue the newnesse of Protestancy by the new and before vnheard of nams, which protestants giue to themselues, and to their Church and religion. For they call themselues *Protestants, or Ghospellers*: and their Church and Religion *Euangelicall and reformed*. D. Andrewes respons. ad Apol. Bellarm. c. 1. *Protestants is our name.* D. Willet in the Preface of his Synopsis: *VVe refuse not the name of Protestants. This name agreeth fitly to our profession.* Præfat. consensus Poloniæ: *VVe are termed Ghospellers.* Iezler lib. de bello Euchar. fol. 31. *VVe will be called Gospellers, and woe be to them who call vs otherwise.* His maiesty in his declaration against Vorstius pag. 49: *The men of our Religion doe ofttimes take*

The names of Protestants are new.

to

to them the name of Gospellers. D. Morton part. 1. Apol. lib. 1. cap. 7: *If ye aske where is the Euangelicall and reformed Church, all will straight poine their finger to the Protestats assembly.* But surely all these names are new and neuer heard of before Luther, neither can there be any name designed, which before Luthers time was proper to the Protestant company. But it is incredible that there should haue bin such a company, and yet that it neuer had any proper or peculiar name giuen either by those of that company or of any others.

10. Lastly I proue the nouelty of the Protestant Church by that, that Protestants knowing well the newnesse therof, deny that the greatest antiquity among Christian Churches is a marck of the true Church of Christ, as doth Iunius lib. de Eccles. cap. 16. yea some of them are so offended at this marck of Antiquity, as they bid vs (a) shut our eyes at it, and say that it is a (b) bastardly marke, and rather a mark of the (c) Synagogue of Antichrist, the of the church of Christ. Neuertheles seeing it ought to be vndoubted amongst Christians, that since Christs Church was founded by him, it neuer failed or perished, and that it is manifest, that he founded his true Church before any false Christian in imitation of him began a false Christian Church, it ought also to be certain that she which amongst all Christian Churches is the most ancient, is the very true Church of Christ. Neither would euer Protestants deny this, if they did not too wel know, that their Church is far yonger then the Roman, as being (according to their saying) her daughter.

(a) *Luth. tom. 2. fol. 367.*
(b) *Raino. Confer. c. 3. diuis. 2.*
(c) *Pier. l. de Eccles. n. 3.*

11. Out of all which hath beene recited in this chapter, I make my eight demonstration in this sort: *If the Protestant Church and Religion were in Luthers*

syme

tyme new or builded or begun a new, he was the Author and beginner thereof. But so it was, as hath beene made manifest by the aforesayd confessions of Protestants. Therefore Luther was the Author thereof.

That Protestants do plainly confesse, that Luther was the Author and Beginner of their Church and Religion.

CHAP. XIIII.

THE ninth demonstration, that Luther was the Author of the Protestant Church and religion, shalbe taken out of Protestants open confessions thereof. First therefore they say, that he was the first who openly preached Protestancy. Luther Præfat. in tom. 1: *The Duch men did looke what would be the event of so great a matter, which before none either Bishop or Devine durst touch.* Ibi. fol. 159. It is said, *Luther first of all in our age did taxe the Popes abominations, and illustrate the ancient and pure doctrine of the Church.* And Præfat. disput. fol. 370. *I first allowed the marriage of Bishops.* In cap. 3. Galat. tom. 5. fol. 333: *Many gave God thankes, that by the Ghospell, which by Gods grace we then first of all preached, &c.* In cap. 4. fol. 387. *God in this Later tyme hath againe revealed the truth of the Ghospell by vs unto the ungratefull world.* Epist. ad Argentinenses tom. 7. *We dare boast, that Christ was first published by vs.* Melanchthon Præfat. in tom. 3: *With what joy did men receave the first sparckle of light discovered by Luther.* præf. in tom. 2. Lutheri: *God by him restored the Ghospell to vs.* Againe: *He recalled the minds of men to the Sonne of God, and as the Baptist shewed the lambe that taketh away the sinnes of the world.* And præfat. in tom. 3: *When there was great darcky-*

Luther the first that preached his Ghospell.

First published Christ.

First spark of Protestancy.

darcknesse the Church, and the light of the Ghospell was oppressed, Luther layd open the iustice of fayth. The vniuersity of VVittemberg in Hospin. part. 2. histor. fol. 250: Out of this Church and schoole did shine the first light of pure doctrine touching God and Crist, which our new aduersaryes are forced to graunt, though they burst with enuy. Amsdorfe, Alber and others write, that Luther was the first vnder heauen, who impugned externall sacrifice & Priesthood in the new testament. Schusselburg lib. 2. Theol. Caluin. fol. 130. sayth that Vrsinus a Caluinist was impudent, when he wrote that he heard Conrad Pellican say, that many learned men in Germany held the doctrine of the Ghospell before Luther appeared, and that Pellican himselfe had reiected Purgatory before Luthers name was heard of. This lye (sayth Schusselburg) the later Caluinists haue refuted. And fol. 228. he affirmeth, that Luther began the refining of the doctrine of the Ghospell. This praise (sayth he) we truly and with good right giue to Luther, though the Caluinists take it in very ill part. Morgerstern tract. 145. sayth, It is ridiculous to thinke that before Luther any held the pure doctrine, and that Luther receaued it of them, and not rather they of him. Milius in explicat. confess. August. art. 17. If Luther had had orthodox all forerunners in his office, there had beene no need of a Luther in reformation. The Author of the booke entituled Prognostica or Finis mundi pag. 12. Luther (as is confessed) first brought in the ghospell at the end of the world. Brentius lib. de Cœna in fine. God raised vp Luther to carry before vs the torch of the knowledg of Christ. And Smedensted apud Hospin. part. 2. histor. fol. 232: He first in our age brought into the world the light of the Ghospell, after it had beene extinguished. Thus the Lutherans: And in like manner the Sacramentaryes. Zuinglius respons. ad Luther tom. 2. fol. 380. thus speaketh Luther: Thou first camest into the field. Ibidem in Exeges. fol. 335. We willingly acknowledge thee to be the cheifest

The first light.

Had no predecessours.

The first that brought in the Ghospell.

thiefest deuider of the Ghospell, the Diomedes who durst set vpon the Roman Venus, the Ionathas who durst alone assaile the campe of the Palestins. Bucer de Cœna pag. 675. calleth Luther our first Apostle of the pure Ghospell, and 673. sayth, *Luther first in our age did impugne superstitiõ.* Caluin writeth that he began to take the cause in hand, and first shewed the way. Danæus lib. de Baptismo cap. 15: *Luther first gaue others occasion to thinke rightly of mans iustification before God.* Lauather de diffid. Euchar. anno 1546. *Luther first in our age did by diuers writings openly inueigh against Popish errours.* Author Orthodoxi consensus in Præfat. Apol: *Luther and Zuinglius were the first, who began to reprehend inueterate errours.* Againe: *The first teachers of Germany, Luther, Melanchton, &c.* Amongst English Protestants M. Iewell in defens. Apol. part. 1. cap. 7. diuis. 3: *Thus I say, in this later age after your so long darcknesse, Luther was the first that preached the Ghospell of Christ.* M. Fox in his Acts pag. 402: *Luther opened the veine long before hidden.* M. Wotton in his examination of the title of the Roman Clergy: *It might be truly sayd, that Luther was the first who in that tyme did publish Christ, especially in the chiefe points of the Ghospell, which is iustification by fayth in Christ. And in this respect it is an honour for Luther to haue been a sonne without a father, a scholler without a maister.* Yee see how plainly they say, that Luther *first preached the Ghospell, first brought in the Ghospell, first shewed the way, first published Christ, discouered the first sparcle, first layd open the iustice of fayth, had no orthodoxall Predecessours, was a sonne without a Father, and a scholler without a maister*, and that in the article of iustification by only fayth, which the soule, hinges, and summe of Protestancy.

First shewed the way.

Scholler without a maister.

2. Secondly without Luthers help no man had knowne a iote of Protestancy. Luther cont. Regem Angliæ tom. 2. fol. 497: *Vnles we had opened the way, they*

Nothing at all.

Not one word.

Not one iote.

Neuer so little.

Luther kindled the Protestant light.

Laid the foundation.

were like to haue vnderstood nothing at all, either of Christ or of the Ghospell. In cap. 15. 1. lec. tom. 5. fol. 134: *The gospell is by our labour and diligence brought into light, and they first learnt it of vs, without our paynes they could neuer haue learnt one word of the Ghospell*. And fol. 141: *God hath called vs by his holy spirit, that by vs Christ might be manifested & known to the world. This prayse they cannot take from vs, that we were the first & carryed away the prize of bringing the Ghospell into light of which they would not haue knowne one iote, vnlesse by our paines and study it had beene brought forth*. And ibidem in cap. 17. Matth. he sayth that without him the Sacramentaries and others *would not haue knowne neuer so little of the Euangelicall truth*. Zuinglius in Exegesi tom. 2. fol. 358. writeth these wordes of Luther: *If they had not had it of vs, doubtlesse they would haue knowne nothing of*. And those of Zurich in their confession write thus: *Luther boasteth, that himselfe is the Prophet and Apostle of the Germans who hath learnt nothing of any, and all haue learnt of him. None knew any thing but what they haue knowne by him*.

3. Thirdly they write, that Luther did kindle the Protestant light. Schusselburg tom. 13. Catal. hæret. pag. 897: *By Luthers ministery the cleare light of the Ghospell is kindled againe for vs*: Lobechius disput. 1. pag. 6. *By this mans Ministery the Lord hath kindled in Germany the light of the heauenly truth*. M. Iewel defens. Apol. part. 1. cap. 7. diuis. 3. pag. 56. *Luther and Zuinglius were appointed of God to kindle againe the light which you had quenched*. Verheiden in his Images, at the Image of Luther: *Thou first didst preach the Ghospell with so great constancy. Thou didst lighten the torch of the Ghospell to the world*. And at the image of Zuinglius he sayth of him and Luther: *They two Architects laying the foundation of the Euangelicall kingdome*. D. Whitaker cont. 4. quest. 5. cap. 3. pag. 693: *Luther lighted a torch which no floods can put out*. And

Prefat

Præfat. tom. 2. Danæi, it is sayd: *God rayſed vp Luther for to kindle and reſtore to the world the light of his Ghoſpell.* And what is it to be a kindler of light, but to be Authour therof.

4. Fourthly they ſay, that Luther was the *renewer, the Founder, the Reſtorer, the ſetler and promulgater of their Church and Religion.* Zuinglius in Exegeſi tom. 2. fol. 358. writeth, that Luther challengeth to himſelf *all the inſtauration of fayth.* Illyricus in Schuſſelburg. tom. 13. Catal. hæret. fol. 850: *This ſame religion was renewed and ſetled by Luther.* Hamburgenſes ibidem fol. 658. *Luther truly the renewer of diuine worship.* Heſhuſius lib. de præſentia Chriſti fayth of Luther: *He was that notable inſtrument by which true religion was renewed.* Saxonici in the conference at Aldburg Scripto 7. pag. 319. ſpeake thus: *Since the tyme of the Ghoſpel renewed by Luther.* Hemingius in Schuſſelburg. lib. 2. Theol. Caluin Pap. 133. *Luther reſtored the ancient worship which our firſt parents receaued of God, and which Chriſt commended to his Church.* Caluin admonit. 2. pag. 147: *By his endeauour principally the purity of the Ghoſpell was reſtored:* And pag. 768. *God rayſed Luther & others, by whoſe Miniſtery our Churches were founded and inſtituted.* The Proteſtant Princes in Germany in Schuſſelburg tom. 13. catal. pag. 877. write that the King of Nauarre *willingly affirmeth the French Churches to acknowledge Luther to be their Father in Chriſt.* Or as Thuanus lib. 79. hiſtor. reporteth their wordes: *That Luther is eſteemed and honoured of the French Churches as their Father in Chriſt, and that by his miniſtry truth was firſt pulled out.* Beza de Hæret. puniend. pag: 148: *Luther the Renewer of Chriſtian Religion.* And in his Images: *The principall inſtrument of Chriſtianity renewed in Germany.* Danæus cont. 5. pag. 1135. reckoneth Luther amõg thoſe, of whom (ſaith he) *all other men haue receaued*

Renewed religion & ſetled it

Reſtored purity of the Ghoſpel.

Renewed religion.

what light of the Ghospell they haue. And lib. 1. de Euchar. cap. 1. termeth him the Renewer of the Ghospell of Christ. And Apol. pro Eccles. Heluet: The first renewer of the Church. Hospin. part. 2. hist. fol. 134: The first renewer of Euangelicall truth and doctrine. Bucer Relp. ad Epist. Abrincen. pag. 613. writeth that God by Luther hath merueilously and happily restored the summe of the Ghospell in our age. D. Whitaker cont. 2. quest. 5. cap. 12. pag. 528: Luther only tooke vpon him to restore religion corrupted, and to renew the ancient and true doctrine. And ad Rat. 10. Campiani calleth him the Renewer of the old faith, or as the English Apology termeth him the promulgator of this doctrine. D. Humphrey in Prolegomenis pag. 82 saith: VVe reuerence Luther as a great renewer of Religion. And what is it to be a renewer, Restorer, Setler of a thing corrupted, especially if he restore the summe thereof, as Bucer sayd that Luther restored the summe of Religion, but to be an Author or maker of it according to the very substance thereof.

First Renewer of the Church & truth.

Restored the summe of the Ghospell. Restored Religion.

5. Finally, they plainly graunt, that Luther was the first to whom Protestancy was reuealed, that he layd the first foundation of Protestant Religion, and that he was the captaine, Author, and Begetter therof. Luther himselfe in sermone, Quid sit homini Christiano præstandum tom. 7. fol. 274. speaketh thus to Protestants: I was the first whome God set in these lists. I was also the first, to whome God vouchsafed to reueale these thinges which are now preached vnto you. Behould Christian Reader a new (a) Aetius surnamed Atheist, who sayd, that those thinges were now reuealed to him by God, which hitherto he would haue to be hidden vnto all. A new (b) Eunomius, who sayd, that he had found a new way to God and vnheard of which none before had perceaued. A new (c) Nestorius, who gloried that he first vnderstood the Scripture. A new

Luther first to whome Protestats was reuealed.

(a) Theod. l. 2. c. 18.

(b) Basil. l. cont. Eun.

(c) Vinc. fr. 42.

Cata-

Cataphryg. (d) who sayd: *We haue the first reuelation & of vs beginneth the Christian sayth.* For of vnes (Luther) began the Protestant sayth, and thou wert the first, to whom the God of this world (as the Apostle speaketh) vouchsated to reueneale those thinges which haue beene preached to Protestants: *To thee alone* (that I may vse Tertullians wordes) *hath truth been reuealed. Forsooth thou hast found greater fauour and more plentifull grace at the Diuells hands.* Againe in expos. Papaselli tom. 2. fol. 398. Luther hath these words: *When I layd the first foundation of this cause*, as Bullinger Præfat. Comment. in Ioan. writeth of Zuinglius saying: *When Zuinglius layd the first foundation of Euangelicall doctrine.* Moreouer Luther tom. 3. fol. 206. writeth thus to his most inward fellow Melanchon: *The city is full of the noyse of my name, and all men desire to see the man the Herostratus of so great a fire.* Ye see, how in a letter to his most assured friend, he confesseth himselfe to be the Herostratus, that is, the Author of that fire wherewith not the temple of Diana, but the temple of God burneth. Melanchon also acknowledged the like, as it appeareth by these words of Luther in a letter to him tom. 9. Wittemberg. Germ. fol. 416. *Thou writest, that for my authorityes sake thou didst follow me as the author, and leader or captaine in this matter.* Behould how Melanchon accounted Luther the Author. And what suspicion is there, that Melanchon should in this matter write otherwise to him then he thought. Schusselburg tom. 8. Catal. pag. 363. defineth true Lutherans or Protestants to be those, *who imbrace the doctrin of the Gospell amending Popish abuses, of which amendement* (sayth he) *Luther was the Author.* And the same meane they, who call Luther the Author of the Protestant reformation. For they protest amendment or reformation is

(d) Athan. de Synod. Præscrip. cap. 34.

Laid the first foundation of Protestancy.

An Herostratus.

Author & leader.

indeed (as hath beene shewed before) a substantiall mutation or change of religion, and therefore the Authour of such an amendment or reformation is indeed the Author of a new Church and religion. D. Sutcliue lib. 2. de Eccles. cap. 3. pag. 237. writeth in this manner: *VVho were the first Authors of raysing the Church fallen downe, as Cranmer, and other our Bishops, also Luther, Zuinglius &c.* And cap. 7. pag. 328. *The Princes who first followed the Authours of restoring religion.* Osiander in Sleidan fol. 22. sayd that Luther & Melanthon *had made a certaine diuinity which sauoured more the flesh then the spirit.* Lobechius disput. 1. pag. 26. calleth Luther *the first deuiser of the Confession of Auspurg.* And Melchior Neofanius Pastour of the Church of Brunswich in loc. Kemnitij part. 2. sayth: *How much doth all Duch-land owe to worthy Luther for his great deserts, who was the Author of pure Religion.* D. Couel also in his defens. of Hooker art. 19. pag. 130. plainely confesseth, that *some Protestants make Luther and Caluin Authours of the religion which they hold.* And M. Horne in his harbour maketh England speake in this manner: *I am thy Country England, which brought forth blessed man Iohn VVicliffe, who begot Hus, who begot Luther, who begot truth.* And heereupon it ariseth, that (as Rescius in his Ministromachia p. 15. reporteth) the Lutherans call Islebium (where Luther was borne) their new Bethleem. Forsooth because there was borne their new Messias, the begetter Author, and founder of their religion. Mark now Reader how Luther, by his owne and other Protestants confession was, *the first to whome Protestant doctrine was reuealed, layd the first foundation of the Protestant cause, was the Authour of the Protestant amendment or reformation, was the deuiser of the first Protestant Confession, was the Herostratus of the Protestants fire, finally was the leader, maker, begetter, and*

Author.

Maker.

Deuiser.

Authour.

Begetter.

A new Bethleem.

and Author of the Protestant Church, and Religion. Which is in plaine termes the very same which in all this booke I endeauour to proue. Iustly therefore may Protestants sing to Luther as Lucretius did to his Epicure the Author & beginner of Epicurisme. Those also of Basle were not ashamed in the Epitaph of his tombe to call Oecolampadius, *the first author of Euangelicall doctrine in that citty*, as report Hospin. and Lauather in their Hostories an. 1531. and Iunius lib. 4. de Eccles. cap. 8. Neither was it peculiar to Luther to spread deuises vnder the name of religiō For thus writeth Iezler. de bello Euchar. fol. 26. of Ministers: *Matters deuised of some few, we thrust vpon the whole world*. And King Henry 8. when he began to encline to Protestancie, set forth articles with this title, *Articles deuised of his Maiesty*. Lib. 3.

6. And from this cuidēce & acknowledgement that Luther was the Author of Protestant religion, it proceedeth. First, that Luther oftentimes calleth it *his doctrine, his gospell, his word, his cause, his part*. For so he speaketh tom. 1. fol. 138. tom. 2. fol. 23. 39. 93. 238. 488. 493. 494. tom. 3. fol. 555 tom. 5. fol. 290. tom. 6. fol. 79. and other where often. Secondly it ariseth that true Protestancie is called *Lutherans doctrine, the Lutheran cause, the Lutheran religion, the Lutheran businesse, and Lutheranisme*. Of Luther himselfe tom. 2. fol. 37. and 497. Of Frederick the Electour tom. 1 Lutheri fol. 237. Of his Counsailers tom. 2. fol. 116. Of the deuines of Mansfeld in Schusselburg tom. 8. pag. 270. Of Schusselburg himselfe Epist. dedicat. tom. 4. Of Melanchon tom. 2. Lutheri fol. 193. 197. Of Kemnice Epist. dedicat. lib. de duabus naturis. Of Hutter in Analysi Confess. August. pag. 595. Of Brunsselse Respons. ad

Protestancy is Luthers doctrine.

Protestāts terme themselues Lutherās,

Spongiam Erasmi. Of Lobechius in Epist. dedicat. Disput. Of George Fabritius l. 1 & 8. Orig. Saxon. and of other Lutherans. And in like maunce of Sacramentaries also, as of Bucer in Matth. 26. & lib. de Cura animorum pag. 261. Of Hospin. Prefat. part. 2 Histor. Of Scultete Con. sæcular. Of D. Morton 1. part. Apol. lib. 1. cap. 45. and others Thirdly therof proceedeth, that the true and proper Protestants are called Lutherans, both of themselues and of others. For thus speaketh Luther in psalm. 118. tom. 7. fol. 551: *I graunt my selfe to be a Lutheran.* And in like manner speaketh he ibidem fol. 79. 242. 233. 361. & 400. And tom. 2. fol. 473. and in Hospin. part. 2. fol. 134. So also speaketh Melanchthon in dominicam 8. Trinit. tom. 1. and in Hospin. lib. cit. fol. 72. and Brentius also ibid. fol. 107. So speaketh the Confession of Saxonie in the Preface, and the Saxon Ministers in the Conference of Aldburg pag. 60. Vrban. Regius in Iudicio de Conuentu Norimberg pag. 9. Amsdorfe in Bucer in Scriptis Anglicis p. 635. Matheus Iudex in Edicto æterni Dei. Iames Andrewes in Colloq. Montisbel. pag. 179. Yea Grauer in the Preface of his Caluinisticall absurdities dedicateth his booke *Vnto the proper Lutherans*: and pag. 61. affirmeth, that their men are called Lutherans, that they may be distinguished from Papists and Caluinists. Scusselburg tom. 17. Catal. pag. 866. sayth, *The Deuines of our part call themselues, and the Defenders of their opinion, Lutherans.* Which also affirmeth Reineccius tom. 1. Armat. cap. vlt. Hutten in Expostulat cum Erasm. sayth: *I acknowledge the name of Lutheran.* And Hailbruner: *We are not ashamed of the name.* And Andrew Schafman in Prodromo bringeth many reasons to proue, that they did well

in

in calling themselues Lutherans. And those of Berga (as Hospin reporteth in Concord. Discord. c. 20.) say that, *All the sincere doctours of the Church call themselues Lutherans of Luther.* The same also testifie the Sacramentaries. For those of Newstade against the booke of Concord. cap 6. pag. 213. say *they account none a sincere disciple of Christ, vnlesse he wilbe called as well a Lutheran as a Christian.* The author of the orthodoxe Consent in Prefat. Apologet. *They take to themselues seditious names vpon a preposterous and too great esteeme of their masters.* Pareus in cap 2. Galat. lect. 24: *They doe not only call themselues Lutherans of Luther, but also willbe so called of all.* Beza in Conspicil. pag. 8: *Ye all will be named and called Lutherans.* And pag. 56: *Not content with the name of Christians, they call themselues Lutherans, and reiuyce to be so called.* Danæus Apol. cont. Iac. Andreæ saith that *He glorieth in Luther as in an other Christ, of whome euery where he thundereth, & calleth himselfe a Lutheran a Lutheran &c.* And Resp. ad Selnecer he saith, that Selnecer *Freely confesseth, that the Dutch Churches terme themselues Lutherans.* Vrbin in Catechism. pag 494. saith: *This is the opinion of them who call themselues Lutherans.* Zuichius Epist. dedicat. Miscellan: *Many are not ashamed euen in printed bookes to call themselues Lutherans.* And Iezler de bello Euchar. fol. 115: *Some haue no shame euen in pulpit to say: We wilbe Lutherans constantly.* And at some times euen the sacramentaries seeme to be desirous of the surname of Lutherans. For those of Newstade in Admonit. de lib Concordiæ pag. 106. compliane, that *some would seeme to be the only disciples of Luther.* Musculus in locis tit. de hæresi pag. 664 saith: *No man condemneth true Lutherans, vnlesse he be ignorant of the truth or very naughty.* And the Protestant Princes of Germanie in Thuan. lib. 79. Histor. pag. 595. relate, that the King of Nauarre

wrote

wrote to them, that *if the French Protestants, were to be termed of any man, they ought most of all to be called Lutherans. Because when this name was odious in France for almost threescore years, many by fire, byt ack, be death sealed with their blood the testimonie of that doctrin which they received first of Luther.* Scultete also in Concione 1ª circulari cõpareth Luther with the Apostolicall men. Besides the Sacramentaries call Luthers true follwers Lutherãs, as Zuinglius tom. 1. fol. 420. 436. 470. Oecolampadius ibidem fol. 479. and in Hospin part. 2. fol. 84. 112. 126. Tigurini ibidem fol 88. Bucer in cap Rom. & in Scriptis Angl. pag. 669. Martyr tom. 2. loc. Epist. ad Caluin. Hospin. lib. cit. fol. 91. Caluin in Zanchius lib. 2. Epist. pag. 78. Daneus ibidem pag. 401. Zanchius himselfe pag. 394. Pareus lib. 5. de Amiss. grat. cap. 1. & 2. lib 4. cap. 17 lib. 6 cap. 1. Vorstius in Antibellarm. pag. 561. D. Whitaker cont. 1. quest. 2. cap. 3. and quest. 5. c. 8. and quest. 6. cap. 9. cont. 4. quest. 5. cap. 3. & lib. 3. de Concupisc. cap. 9. & lib. 3. de Scrip. cap. 2 sect. 3. D. Fulke de Success. pag. 321. M. Perkins in Explicat. Symboly col. 781. & 790. Yea Iezler loc. cit. fol. 39. & Vorstius in Collat. cum Piscatore write, *that properly and vulgarly they are called Lutherãs.* Wherupon D. Humfrey ad Rat. 2. Campian. pag. 128. sayth, *Lutherans vulgarly called.*

7. Hereby we see, first that the Lutherans glory of the name of Luther, as the Donatists (which S. Augustin reporteth) did of the name of Donatus. Secondly, that they glory of a schismaticall name: for such is the name of Lutherans, as Luther himselfe confesseth in D. Morton part. 1. Apol. lib. 1. cap. 8. And Hospin Præfat. part. 2. Histor. Vorstius in Antibellarm. pag. 149 Yea D. Whitaker cont. 2. quest.

2. quest. 5. cap. 2. sayth, *that to take the name of any man at all, is Heretical and Schismatical, and that heretikes carry the names of their maisters, and willingly acknowledge such names.* Thirdly it appeareth, that the English Apologie vntruly sayd, that Luthers disciples are called Lutherans in disgrace or derision. For Grauer lib. cit. sayth, they are termed so *for distinction sake.* Lauatherus and Hospin. Præfat. Histor. say, they call them so *for doctrine sake; that it may be knowne whome they meän.* And Scul ete so termeth them for honours sake. And surely sith both Sacramentaries, the common people, and themselues also terme them Lutherans, and glory also in that name, it cannot be sayd, that they are called so in disgrace or contemp. Fourthly it appeareth to be false, that D. Morton lib. cit. and D. Sutlive lib. de Eccles. cap. 2. say: *It is rather to be attributed to a lye then to Luthers desert, that Protestants call themselues Lutherans.* For (as we see) Luther himselfe called them so, and therin they follow his example. Neither skilleth it, that Luther did once dislike this name, because he did oftentimes vse it, & it was vsuall to Luther to allow and disallow the same thing. Fiftly we see it to be false, which D. Whitaker writeth cont. 2 quest. 5. cap. 2 pag. 494: *None of vs euer called himselfe a Lutheran: we acknowledge not these names, nor are we delighted with them. This name our aduersaries haue fastened vpon vs, only vpon malice and emnie: Neither are we called Lutherans but of the Papists.* False also is that, which D. Fulke sayth de Succes. pag. 188. that *they acknowledge no other name proper to their religion, but the names of Christians and Catholiques.* These I say are false; for Luther (whome D. Whitaker accounteth his father) and the Lutherans (whome he termeth his brethren in Christ) doe call themselues so, and are well

well pleased with that name. Besides, they are so termed of the Sacramentaries and common people, and therfore not of Papists only, nor vpon malice and enuie, but (as Grauer sayd) truly for distinction sake, and that most iustly. For as S. Athanase sayth, *VVho derive the origen of their faith from other then Christ, iustly carry the surnames of their Authors.* But Protestants (as we haue shewed) confesse that they derive the origen of their faith from Luther. Therfore iustly they beare his name.

8. Out of all which hath bin rehearsed in this chapter, I thus frame my ninth demonstration of this Matter: *If Luther and many other famous Protestants sometimes indeed, some times in plaine words do confesse, that Luther was the Author of their Church and religion, he ought to be so taken and reputed. But they do so confesse. Ergo.* The Minor is cuident by all that is sayd in this Chapter: And the Maior, by what we sayd in the Preface. For so many and such principall Protestants knew well the origen of their religion, and willingly would not lye to the disgrace and ouerthrow therof.

That Protestants cannot proue their Church to haue bin before Luthers time, by any probable argument or sufficent testimonie.

CHAP. XV.

THe tenth and last demonstration for to proue that Luther was the first Author of the Protestants Church and religiō I will take from hence, that albeit Protestants doe sometimes boldly affirme their Church and religiō to haue bin before Luthers time

lume. Yet they can neuer proue it by any reasonable argument or sufficient testimony. Which thing alone would suffice to shew, that (as I sayd before) it is vnfable vainely feigned, falsely affirmed, and fondly beleiued. It hath bin alwayes the fashion of heretiques boldly to auouch any thing, but few things to proue euen in shew. This S. Augustin doth often obserue in the Manichees and Donatists, and some of his sayings we haue alleadged before. Of Eunomius S. (a) Basil noteth the same, and S. (b) Ambrose of all heretikes saying, *Heretiques are wolues, they can howle, but proue nothing*. And this doe Protestants confesse. For thus D. Whitaker cont. 2 quest. 5. cap. 18: *Heretikes are wont to boast and promise truth, but not to proue it*. Of Luther thus writeth Zuinglius tom. 2. fol. 473. and 509: *One argument he hath in all these matters, He sayd it*. And fol. 447: *Luther relyeth only vpon his toyes and deuises*. Fol. 395: *Thou puttest forth whatsoeuer the motion of thy affections do appoint, and when a reason of thy saying is exacted of thee, thou standest naked, vnarmed*. And of the Lutherans thus writeth Erasmus: *They say it, and for that alone they will be beleiued*. Of the Sacramentaryes in like manner Luther writeth in defens. verb. Cœnæ tom. 7. fol. 384. *One word not easily ouerturneth all these thinges: for if you deny them, then as butter melteth in the sun so they quaile*. And the same is euident to all that read the bookes either of Lutherans or Sacramentaryes. In the meane tyme they cry to vs, that that Pythagoricall word: *He sayd it*, hath no other place but in (e) Christ and the Scripture: that in other it is the proper argument of (d) fooles: that to affirme any thing beside scripture, is to (e) trifle: that til we proue our affirmatiue, they will stand in their (f) negatiue, and exact (g) demonstrations, that is, either expresse

(a) *Lib. 2. cont. Eunom.*

(b) *Serm. 6. in psal. 118.*

In Distrib.

(c) *Vide lib. 2. de script. cap. 20. sect. 5. Bullinger in comp. l. 2. c. 3.*

(d) *Portius Antibel. p. 468.*

(e) *Pomal. l. 1. de Antic. c. 19.*

(f) *Lamb. tom. 2. fol. 437.*

(g) *Portius l. 2. Pulley de sacram. p. 70.*

proue testimonies of scripture, or forcible reason deduced from thence. Now we say the same to them. They affirme their Church to haue bin before Luthers time. We deny it vntil they proue it. Neither let them affirme it only, which is the proofe of fooles & wilfull men, but if they cannot bring demonstrations therof, at least let them produce some credible testimonie, or some effectuall reason and argument. Otherwise their beliefe in this matter, is (as sayth Tertullian) *a peruerse beliefe which will not beleeue things proued, and beleeueth things which cannot be proued.*

Scorp. c. 12.

2. That in this matter they be destitute of all credible testimonie, appeareth sufficently by what hath heretofore bin rehearsed of their owne confessions, and now we will shew, that they want also all probable reason or argument. For all their arguments herein be reduced to this one: *Our doctrine is the doctrine of Christ: Therfore our Church was alwayes since Christ.* For thus agreeth D. Whitaker cont. 2. q. 5. c. 3. p. 498: *I vse this argument: VVhat Church soeuer keepeth the doctrine & preaching of the Apostls, she is the Apostolical Church. But our Church doth so, Therefore &c. Of the Maior* (sayth he) *no controuersy can be made.* And cap. 5. p. 505: *It was our Church which was in the tymes of the Apostles and afterward vnto the Apostasie. But how doe we proue this? By this reason, that our Church keepeth the same faith and doctrine which the Church in the Apostles time and afterward kept.* And cont. Dureum sect. 1: *If thou holdest Christs doctrine thou art a Catholike.* And sect. 2: *It must needs be the true Church of Christ which keepeth & conserueth Christs doctrine deliuered in his word.* Dancus cont. 3. pag. 288. *VVith vs is the true Church of God, because we retaine the true doctrine of Christ.* Lubbertus lib. 5 de Eccles cap. 1: *If the doctrine which our Church professeth, be the same which Christ deliuered, then*

our

our Church is that which Christ instituted. D. Fulke lib. de Succeſſ. pag. 27: *Seeing we are ready to proue out of the ſcripture, that we profeſſe the ſame doctrine of fayth, and manners which Chriſt would haue to be perpetuall by euident reaſon, our ſucceſſion is manifeſt, although all Hiſtoryes were ſilent of the names of the Perſons and continuation of ſucceſſion.* And the like he hath pag. 154. and 331. D. White in his way pag. 403. ſayth he knoweth his Church was alwayes, becauſe it holdeth the fayth of the Scripture, which cannot be extinguiſhed. The like he ſayth pag. 320. & 326. Likewiſe Luther de notis Eccleſ. tom. 7. fol. 149. Caluin in Matth. cap. 24. verſ. 28. and generally al of them whiles they make the truth of doctrin the infallible marke of the Church. *O proofe* (that I may cry out in S. Auguſtins words) *O errour, o dotage.* And with S. Athanaſe: *A worthy hereſy which wanteth probable reaſons to vnderproppe it.* For this argument on which all their belief, that their Church was before Luther doth rely, is a moſt fond ſophiſme, and moſt counterfait ſyllogiſme, as manifeſtly appeareth, whether it be framed in that forme wherein D. Whitaker hath propoſed it, or whether it be reduced to this forme: *That Church which holdeth the true doctrine of Chriſt hath alwayes beene, and conſequently before Luther. The Proteſtant Church holdeth the true doctrin, holdeth the true doctrin of Chriſt as (ſay they) we will proue by ſcripture. Therefore it hath bin alway.* Lib. 2. contra Adrian.

3. I anſwere that this argument is a manifeſt ſophiſme for many cauſes. For if the Maior be particuler, ſo that the ſenſe thereof be, *Some Church which holdeth the true doctrine of Chriſt hath alwayes beene*, it is true becauſe the catholik church, which holdeth Chriſts true doctrine, hath alwayes been: but then the Syllogiſme is ſophiſm for want of due forme, inferring

a conclusion out of particuler propositiõ. But if the Maior be vniuersall, according as it is made of D. Whitaker, then so farre is it from being out of controuersy (as he affirmeth) that it is manifestly false, and no way true, but only apparant, and therefore vnfit to make a true syllogisme, but only a counterfait and a sophisme. That it is manifestly false, is euident, because that Church or company of Christiãs which is strictly and properly termed schismatical, holdeth the true doctrine of Christ as both the Fathers teach, and the Protestants themselues doe also most plainely affirme, & yet it is not the true church of Christ. Wherefore sith (as the Philosopher teacheth) those thinges are probable, which seem true to all, or to most, or to wise men, and those either al or most, or most approued, and such as are not probable serue only to make sophismes; The foresayd Maior, not seeming true to all, or most, or the wisest Christians, yea not euen to the Protestants themselues, it is manifest, that it is no probable propositiõ, but only apparent, and therefore not fit to make a true syllogisme, but only an apparent and counterfait.

Protestãts assume a manifest falsity.

4. That the Fathers teach that a Schismatical Church holdeth the true doctrine of Christ, is manifest by S. Augustine who lib. quest. Euang. pag. 28. tom. 4. sayth: *It vseth to be enquired, wherein Schismatickes differ from heretickes, and this sound, that no difference in sayth but breach of society in communion maketh Schismatikes.* And lib. de fide & Symbolo cap. 10: *Heretikes by believing wrong of God violate the sayth: but Schismatickes by wicked diuisions leape from fraternall charity, albeit they believe aright those thinges which we believe.* And lib. cont. Gaud. cap. 9. refuteth him, because he had sayd, that Schismatikes

That Schismatikes hold true doctrine.

matikes and Heretikes are the same; against which he sayth: *Thou art a Schismatike by sacrilegious division, and an heretike by sacrilegious opinion.* And lib. 1. cont. Cresc. cap. 29. and de gestis cum Emerito affirmeth that the same sayth is had out of the Church. S. Hierome in Tit. 3. *We iudge this difference to be between heresy and schisme that heresy holdeth a naughty opinion, schisme separateth from the Church by dissention of Bishops.* S. Gregory lib. 18. Moral. cap. 14. *Some doe believe false thinges of God, others by Gods help believe rightly of God, but keep not vnity with their brethren, these are divided by schisme.* S. Isidor. lib. 8. Origin cap 3. *Schisme tooke its name of breach, for it believeth the same religion and rites that others do, only is pleased to keep company a part.* The same teach S. Ireneus lib. 4. cap. 62. S. Chrysost. hom. 3. in 1. Cor. S. Optat. lib. 1. 4. & 5. cont. Parmen. and others. And it is manifest by reason. For if Schismatikes did erre also in Fayth, they should not differ from heretikes. And it is graunted both of old and new Heretikes. For thus sayth Faustus in S. Augustine lib. 20. cont. Faustum cap. 3. *Schisme if I be not deceaued, is to believe the same & to worship God in the same manner that others do, only to be delighted with diuision of assemblyes.* Caluin 4. Institut. cap. 2. §. 5. *Austin putteth this difference betwixt heretikes and schismatikes, that they corrupt the sincerity of the fayth with false doctrines: these sometymes enter hauing the like faith breake asunder the band of society.* And in. 1. Cor. cap. 11. vers. 19. *It is known in what sense the ancient vsed both these names (schisme heresy,) they put heresy in difference of doctrine, but schisme rather in alienation of minds, to wit, when any either vpon enuy, or hatred of the Pastours or of fewe at those departed from the Church.* Beza libro de puniendis Hæreticis pag. 89: *Schism properly is the diuision of those who believe the same things* And pag. 150. *Let them remember that we terme them not*

heretikes, who are properly called Schismatiques. The same he hath in 1. Cor. 1. v. 10. and otherwhere. Plessis lib. de Eccles. cap. 1. pag. 16: We call erroneous Churches either heretikes, or schismatikes according as they erre either in faythor in charity. And pag. 32. What pertaineth to schismaticall Churches, either they are simply schismaticall or when heresy also is adioyned as it vseth after schisme, as an ague after a wound. And cap. 10. pag. 340. True and pure schismatiks are those, who holding the same doctrine yet make meetinges a part. Peter Martyr in locis tit. de Schism. pag. 618. I thinke it more plaine to define Schisme to be a cutting a sunder of the Ecclesiasticall peace & vnity. And pag. 619: There may be schisme in the Church without heresy. Aretius also in locis part. 2. fol. 10: Schisme sometymes in the same doctrin breaketh society. Bucan in loc. quest. 33. de Eccl. affirmeth, that schismatiks differ from heretiks because heresy properly is dissention in doctrine. Polan. part. 2. Thes. de notis Eccl. albeit schismaticall Churches agree in the doctrine of truth &c. Zanchius tract. de Eccles. cap.: There may be breach in the symboles of Charity, that is in participation of Sacraments communication of publike prayer, and such like other Ecclesiasticall exercises, to wit, when one thought he agree with the rest of the Church of Christ in the principall heades of Christian fayth, yet I know not for what light causes withdraweth himselfe from the rest of the Church and communicateth not with her in the sacraments. Such (sayth he) are properly called schismatikes. M. Perkins in cap. 5. Galat. vers. 21. Heresy is in doctrine, Schisme in manners, order, and gouernement. D. Fulke de Succes. pag. 165: There may be schisme in the Church, where the same doctrine is held on both parties, & the one wanteth lawfull succession. D. Field lib. 1. of the Church cap. 7: Some professe the whole saving fayth but not in vnity, as schismatiks. Daneus in August. de hæres. cap. 3. He is a schismatike, who retayning the sound doctrine of fayth and that entire, without

without probable and lawfull reason forsaketh not the Ancient rites of the Church. The same he hath Apol. pro Heluet. Eccles. pag. 1485. Bullinger tom. 1. Decad. 5. serm. 2. Vortius in Antibellarm. pag. 190. D. Whitaker cont. 2. quæst. 5. cap. 10. D. Raynolds Prælect. 1. col. 2. Hemmingius in 1. Cor. 1. and others.

5. Now that proper Schismatikes, to wit, such as willfully separate themselues from the Communion of the Church, be not members or parts of the Church, is cleare by the testimony of the Fathers, the confessions of Protestants, and manifest reason. S. Augustin lib. de fide & symbolo cap. 10. sayth: *Neither doth an heretike belong to the Catholike Church, nor a schismatike*. Tract. 3. in 1. Ioan. *All heretikes, all schismatikes are gone out of the Church*. Lib. 3. de Baptism. cap. 19. *All heretikes and schismatikes are false Christians*. And lib 2. cont. Crescon. cap. 29: *I thinke but that any so doteth to believe him to belong to the vnity of the Church, who hath not charity*. The like he hath in many places S. Ambrose lib. 7. in Luc. cap. 11. *Vnderstand that all heretikes and schismatikes are separated from the kingdome of God and from the Church*. S. Optatus lib. 2. *The Church cannot be with any heretikes or schismatikes*. S. Fulgentius de fide ad Petrum cap. 38: *Beleeue most stedfastly and doubt nothing: that not only all Pagans, but also all Iewes, Heretikes, & schismatikes, which end this life out of the church, are to go into euerlasting fire*. The same teach S. Hierome, & S. Chrysostome loc. cit. S. Ignatius Epist. ad Smyrnens. S. Iren. lib. 4. cap. 62. S. Cyprian lib. de vnit. & epist. 41. 51. 55. S. Prosper de vocat. Gentium cap. 4. and the rest. The protestants confessions of this matter we related heretofore, amongst whome lay, that this is an vndoubted truth. Reason also conuinceth the same: for as Caluin confesseth 4. Institut. loc. cit. The co-

That Schismatikes are out of the Church.

Lib. 1. c. 1. num. 4.

munion of the Church is held with two bandes, to wit consent of doctrine and fraternall charity: But Schismatikes breake the band of fraternall charity: therefore they are not within the Church. Againe Danæus lib. 3. de Eccl. c. 5. sayth: This is the marke that thou art of the visible Church, that outwardly thou professe the sayth & communicate with the rest of the Church in the same Sacramẽts: but schismatikes doe not communicate in Sacramentes with the rest of the Church. And D. Feild lib. 3. of the Church cap. 2. sayth: Communion in Sacramentes vnder lawfull Pastours is an essential note of the true Catholike Church: but Shismatiks want this communion. And Casaubon epist. ad Card. Peron. pag. 9. *The true Churches of Christ are united in the vnity of sayth, and doctrine, and communion of minds and in true charity and offices of charity, especially of mutuall prayer.* But Schismatikes are not vnited in charity and offices of mutuall prayer. Finally only Catholikes are members of the Catholike Church, as is euident and (a) Protestants confesse; But Schismatikes are not Catholiks, as the very name doth declare, the Fathers doe teach, and (b) Protestants acknowledge.

(a) *V Vbi. cons. 2. q. 5. cap. 3.*
(b) *Gesner loc. 24. Field l. de Eccles. c. 7.*

6. By this it appeareth that the foresayd Maior which is the foundation of Protestants in this matter, is not only false, but also so manifestly false, as out of this question, it is commonly denyed of Protestants themselues. Besides it is not only false, but also so improbable, that neither it is proued of Protestants, nor can be any other wayes, then by proofe of fooles or willfull men, that is, by their owne saying. For D. Whitaker (as we haue seene) proueth it no other wayes, then by saying, it is out of controuersy, D. Fulke, that it is manifest, But Luther

mor

more boastingly sayth he de Missa prin. tom. 7. f. 247. *This is our solid foundation and most stedfast rocke: Whersoeuer true doctrine of Christ or the Ghospell is preached, there is necessarily the true holy Church of God. And who doubteth of this (sayth he) may in like manner doubt, whether the Ghospel be the word of God.* A notable proofe surely, and fit for Pythagoras schoole, and a sound foundation, on which so fayned a Church should rely, and a fit rock for them to build vpon, who haue left the rocke vpon which Christ built his Church. Wherefore that I may imitate S. Augustine in the like matter. I aske whether God or man hath told them, that wheresoeuer true doctrine is, there is the true Church? If God, let them read it out of the Scripture, where indeed we read, that where the true Church is, there true doctrine is: but contrary wise, that where true doctrine is, there the true Church is, there we neuer read. If men haue told you this: Behold a fiction of man, behold what you beliene, behold what ye serue, behold for what ye rebell, ye run mad, ye burne. Againe, what kind of men were they, surely no other then your selues. And what is your authority, I say not with vs, but euen with your selues? Is (as one of your part sayd) *the iudgement of Lutherans or Sacramentaryes, the square of truth?* Moreouer, seeing that these things are essential or substantial to the true church, to wit, true doctrine, lawfull Pastours, and people following their Pastours, nor any thing can be, vnles all the essentiall parts be, it is sophistry and madnesse to inferre, that that company is the true Church wherin one only of these parts is to be found. If they say, that by the true Church they meane not her which is true in nature, or essence of the Church, but only her which is true in doctrine, of whose essence

Lib. 3. cont. Gaudent. cap. 33.

Parens l. 2. de vnitate. cap. 18.

is only truth of doctrin. First they deceaſe the Reader. For we ſpeak only of the Church true in eſſence, not of that which is only true in doctrin, as a ſchiſmaticall Church may be. Beſides, if they meane ſuch a true Church and vnderſtand their foreſayd Maior vniuerſally, it is falſe; for not euery true Church in that ſenſe is Apoſtolicall or hath euer beene. For a ſchiſmaticall Church is true in doctrine, and yet is neither Apoſtolicall, nor hath euer beene. And if they vnderſtand their Maior particulerly the concluſion followeth not, becauſe it is deduced out of pure particuler propoſitions. And thus much of the Maior.

Proteſtats proofe out of a thing more vnknowne

7. Secondly the foreſayd argument is a ſophiſm becauſe of the Minor, by which one vnknown thing is proued by another, one falſe thing by another, not only falſe, but alſo impoſſible. For it is more vncertaine, that the Proteſtant Church holdeth the doctrin of Chriſt, then that ſhe was before Luther. For albeit ſhe were not before, notwithſtanding it was not impoſſible that ſhe ſhould haue beene, but that ſhe holdeth the doctrine of Chriſt, is both falſe and impoſſible alſo. And as Luther ſayth in defenſ. verb. Cœnæ tom. 7. fol. 385. *It is a mad mans part to proue vncertaine things by others as vncertaine*. And D. Whitaker cont. 2. queſt. 3. cap. 3: *all proofe is by things that are more knowne*. Which alſo he hath cont. 2. queſt. 5. cap. 18. Sadeel præfat. lib. cont. Traditiones. Daneus l. 4. de Eccleſ. cap. 2. D. Morton part. 2. Apol. lib. 2. cap. 37. Pareus lib. 3. de Iuſtificat. cap. 1. Wherupon Luther tom. 2. Præfat. affert. Antic. fol. 95. writeth *Ariſtotle and all ſenſe of nature sheweth, that vnknowne thinges muſt be proued by thinges more knowne, and obſcure thinges by manifeſt*. If therefore, (as Pareus ſayth lib. 1. de Iuſtificat.

ficat. c. 10.) when the Aduerſarie is brought to that, that either he gaineſayth himſelfe, or beggs that which he is to proue, aſſuming that in his proofe which is in debate, or triſleth by repeating now and then the ſame thing, he is vanquiſhed; ſurely then Proteſtants are vanquiſhed, whom in this final work we haue ſhewed often tymes to gaineſay themſelues, now including theſe within the Church, now excluding them, now affirming the Church to be inuiſible, now denying it, now to haue alwayes Paſtours, now denying it, and the like: And in this argumment, with which alone they proue the exiſtēce of their Church before Luther, they aſſume in the Minor, that which moſt of all is in debate: And the Maior they can proue no otherwiſe, then by triſling by repeating it, and ſaying that it is out of all doubt. I adde alſo, that the ſacramentaryes ſay, that the Lutheran Church erreth euen in the fundamentall points, and the like ſay the Lutherans of the Sacramentaries, and ſcarce there is any Proteſtant, who doth not thinke that the Church whereof he is doth erre in ſome points. What reaſon then haue they, out of the trueneſſe of the doctrin of their Churches to inferre their perpetuall exiſtence?

Caluin. 4. Inſtitut. c. 2. §. 12. Nauar. de Eccleſ. Belg. p. 192.

8. Thirdly I adde, that the manner wherwith Proteſtants doe proue the Minor of their foreſayd ſyllogiſme, is ſophiſticall and not ſuch as they exact of vs for proofe of our doctrine. For commonly they exact of vs to ſhew, that our doctrine is contained in expreſſe words in Scripture, or (as Luther ſayth lib. de ſeru. arbit. tom. 2. fol. 440) *ſuch manifeſt teſtimonies as are able ſo to ſtop all mēs mouths, as they are not able to ſay any thing againſt it.* But manifeſt it is, that ſuch be not the proofes wherwith Proteſtants proue their doctrine.

For to omit other points, where is an expresse words in scripture that fundamentall point of their doctrin that we are iustified by only faith? Nay the contrary is so expressly in S. Iames epistle, as therfore Luther blasphemously sayth S. Iames doctrin. And the Lutherans for that very cause deny his epistle to be canonicall. Besides, Protestants doe now confesse, that the scripture is not of it selfe sufficient to end all questions of faith, and that Schismatikes cannot be convinced by scripture. How then can they sufficiently proue al the points of their doctrine by scripture? Againe, themselues acknowledge, that they need certaine meanes to attaine to the right sense of the Scripture and that their meanes are humane and not infallible, as knowledge of tongues, conference of places, and such like, and with all, that such as the meanes be, such is the exposition of Scripture. If therfore their meanes be not infallible, how can their vnderstanding of the scripture be infallible? Moreouer, they fearce euer proue any thing by both principles out of scripture, but almost euermore adioyne one humain principles, as easily will appeare if their proofs be brought to a syllogisticall forme, as well obserue the most learned Bishop of Luçon in his defence of the Principall articles of faith cap. 3. & 5. And how can they be infallibly certaine of the conclusion, which they cannot know but by one humain principle, whereof they can haue no such certainty? Furthermore, because many of their proofes doe not only consist of one humane principle, which is not at al in the scripture, but also they inferre a conclusiõ directly contradictory to that which the scripture in most expresse words teacheth of that matter. As for example, when they proue that the Euchatist is

Tom. 2. in 2. 12. Gen.

Protestats conclude against sense.

Whitak. cont. 1. q. 4. cap. 3.

Whitak. loc. cit. p. 490.

Plessy l. de Euchar. c. 9.

of

not the very body and bloud of Christ, alwayes one of their principles is humane; and besides their conclusiō is flat contrary to expresse words of scripture, which affirmeth that it is Christs very body and bloud. And who is he in his witte, that will perswade himselfe, either that the scripture meaneth, that the Eucharist is not the body & bloud of Christ, which directly it neuer sayth, rather, then that it is his body and bloud, which it as expresly sayth, as euer it sayth any thing, or that that proofe is not sophisticall, which out of one humane principle at least, inferreth the contrary of that, which the scripture most expresly teacheth? Lastly, they neuer proued any one point of their doctrine any otherwise, then euer Heretiks do, that is in their own iudgmēt neuer before any iudge or generall Councell, which Luther himselfe confesseth in c. 27. Gen. tom 6. fol. 368. in the worde *In the affaire of the Gospel we haue decided the matter against all the impiety of the Pope without forme of law. We accused not the Pope, neither could we, for there was no iudge.* Yea the iust doctrin hath bin cōdemned according to all forme of law in the Generall Councel of Trent & of the Patriarch of Constantinople, to whō they appealed, and of al other kinds of Christians.

9. Fourthly I say, that the foresayd argument is a sophisme, in that in a sēsible matter (as the Church is) it concludeth against the sense of all men. For neither did any see the protestant Church before Luther, neither did any mā feele or perceiue himselfe to haue bin a member of such a Church before that time. Wherfore, as he should manifestly play the Sophister who would goe about to proue by scripture that the sunne appeareth at midnight: so likewise doth he, who out of scripture endeuoreth to proue, that there

was

was a protestant Church before Luther, because all mens sense convince the one as well as the other. Besides protestants write, that though faith commaund vs to beleiue things which we see not, yet it doth not commaund vs, not to beleiue that which we see, for otherwise faith should be contrary to sense, and none should become faithfull, but he should first be senseless. But surely wonderfull is the blindnes or wilfulnesse of Sacramentaries, who in the matter of the Eucharist, against the most expresse words of Scripture, will endeuour to proue by sense, that there is not the body of Christ, when as the body of Christ there is not sensible. And here in the matter of existence of their Church before Luther, out of some apparent shew of scripture, against the most manifest sense of all men, will proue, that it was before Luthers time. When as a Church is a sensible thing, and can be felt either of others, or at least of them who are of it. How much better and more reasonably should they proceed, if in the Eucharist where Christs body is not sensible, they would rather giue eare to the most expresse words of scripture then to the suspicions of their seses, which can iudge of nothing but of sensible accidents; and in the matter of the Church, whose being is sensible, they would submit their vncertaine (if not false) expositions of scripture, not only to the sense of all men, but also the most certaine expositions of the Church and Fathers. But this sheweth, that in their beleife they are guided neither by sese nor scripture but out of them both borrow a shew of proofe for that which of their mere wilfulnes or fancy they choose to beleiue.

10. Thus thou seest (Christian Reader) for how vaine a sophisme, whose Maior is manifestly false &c

so

so false, as that out of this matter it is generally denyed of Protestants themselues, and so improbable also, as that it cannot be proued in no shew or colour, and whose Minor is more doubtfull, then the conclusiõ it selfe, and the manner of proving sophisticall, and no other then the proofes of al Heretikes be: for how vaine a sophisme (I say) then the which scarce any can be more vaine, Protestants beleiue, or rather will seeme to beleiue, a thing wholy incredible, and in a thing sensible, against the sense of al mãkind, to wit, that before Luther there was a Church which held the whose substance or all the substantiall and fundamentall points of Protestancy; nor in so weighty a matter respect either their owne consciences, or the iudgements of men, or tribunal of God, or danger of their eternall damnation. Surely, that I may end with S. Basils words, *I moane and bewayle them that for a meane sophisme and counterfait paralogisme they cast themselues into hel.* *Homil. cont. Sabel.*

11. Out of all which hath bin sayd in this chapter, I thus frame my tenth and last demonstration: *If no sufficent testimonie, nor any probable argument, but only one fond sophisme, can be brought to proue that the Protestant Church was before Luther, this is not to be beleiued of any wise and prudent man: But no other proofe can be brought. Therfore &c.* And if it were not before Luther, surely he is the Author of it. The Maior is euident by it selfe, and the minor by what hath bin brought in this chapter. Certainely if euery one of the demõstrations which we haue brought, doe not conuince that the Protestant Church and religion was not before Luther, at least all of them together manifestly conuince it. For by the first fiue demonstrations was shewed that before Luther it was not at all, it was in no place,

was vnknowne of all the world, was not seene of any, nor had any Pastors: And with the rest hath bin demonstrated, that after Luther arose no ancienter Protestant did euer appeare and adioyne himselfe to Luther, that all the first knowne Protestants had bin Papists afore times, that the Protestant company and religion is new, that Luther and other plainly confesse, that he was autho of that religion, and finally that no proofe besides one friuolous fallacie can be brought to shew, that such a Church or religion had bin in former times. And if yet any protestant doubt hereof, let him at least compare al the foresayd demõstrations, wherwith so many wayes out of the very testimonies of Protestants we haue shewed, that no such Church was before Luther, with their vaine sophisme, wherewith they make shew to proue the contrary, and he will easily perceiue on whose side this so important truth is like to stand. And if he make any account of truth, of Gods seruice, of his owne reputation, or eternall saluation he will forsake the Protestants Church, & put himselfe in the lappe of the Catholike Church. Which (as S. Augustine speaketh) euen in the testimony of all mankind hath not only beene in all ages since Christ, but alſo hath had Pastors, nor hath been visible only to her owne, but to others also, and to the whole world, and hath most valiantly fought, ouercome, and triumphed ouer Iewes, Pagans, Heretikes, Schismatiks, and all the gates of hell. To preferre before this most ancient, most glorious church, another newly start vp, many ages lurking, knowne to none not to her owne, and destitute of Pastours, flocke, seat, and appearance, and in truth feigned, and deuised, and (to omit all other proofes) wounded

ded deadly with so many confessions of her owne champions, and proued by one only vaine fallacie; what other thing were it, then to preferre lyes before truth, darcknesse before light, death before life, the synagogue of Satan before the Church of Christ, and finally wilfully to cast himselfe headlong into hell?

What he must obserue who will answere the foresayd demonstration.

CHAP. XVI.

SEEING I haue yielded so much to Protestants, & condescended to so vnequall conditions, as that I haue vndertaken to proue that Luther was the author of their Church and religion by their only Confessions of Luther and other Protestants, it is reason, that if any one of them goe about to answeare my foresayd demõstrations, he should obserue these most iust lawes, which I will here set downe, and which themselues haue prescribed to others.

2. First therfore touching the words of Protestants which I haue alleadged, let him either confesse that they are truely cited by me, or if he denye that, let him not say it only, but let him shew, that they are supposed, falsifyed, or so changed, as that the sense which I alleadge and vrge to my purpose, be either quite altered, or else obscured. For if in any place for brenities sake the words be so little changed, as the sense which I presse, remayne whole and clare, it skilleth not. Because I argue not out of the meere titles or letters, but only out of their sense and signifi-

See Iust. defens. fol. part. 2. c. 3. Kemnitius) Exam. Trid. de script. Apost. Bonon. p. 245. Calouius. Sarium. p. 443.

ſignification. Beſides, if at any time there be ſome colour of cauſing about the alteration of the ſenſe of one or other place (for iuſt cauſe I hope there will not be, though in ſo many places as are here cited it were no meruaile if ſome were miſtaken) let him not therfore cry, that all the teſtimonies are falſified, or think that therby he hath ſatisfied all the reſt.

3. Secondly touching the teſtimonyes themſelues; let him obſerue, that either he anſwereth them all, or at leaſt thoſe, which are the ſtronger, as for the moſt part thoſe are, which are noted in the margent, otherwiſe by the iudgment of the Fathers and Proteſtants alſo, he will ſhew in effect, that though he could not hold his peace, yet could he not anſwere ſufficiently. For as S. Auguſtine (a) ſayth: *Surely that he held his peace, not his tongue, but his cauſe failed him.* And in an other place (b) *I take your ſilence for conſent.* S. (c) Hierome: *You confeſſe more by ſilence then you denie by diſpute.* And againe (d): *It ſkilleth litle, whether I binde mine aduerſary ſleeping or waking, only it is eaſier to binde one that is quiet, then one that reſiſteth.* (e) Luther alſo: *Euill conſciences ſpeake much beſides the matter, but litle to the purpoſe, and ſeldome come to it.* And he noteth that it is the art and nimblenes of Heretikes, to skip ouer the matter and difficulty. Whitaker pronounceth it *to be a ſigne of a moſt deſperate cauſe not to touch the Matter.* And D (f) Billon: *To this thou anſwereſt nothing, and therfore all wiſe men conclude that thou canſt not maintaine that which I thou did diſproue.* D. Sutliue lib. 2 de Eccleſ. cap. 1: *The reſt becauſe they ſay nothing to it, I will take for graunted. For if there had bin any hope of ſ- ſaying it, or any place of calumniating without doubt they would not haue bin ſilent.* And M. (g) Burhill: *Amongſt the wiſer both of our ſide and yours it is your ſilence doth no leſſe hurt his cauſe then a heauy ſyer. For*

(a) *Lib. 1. cont. Gaudent.*
(b) *Lib. 2. cont. Maxim.*
(c) *Epi. 61.*
(d) *Epi. 81.*
(e) *Tom. 7. fol. 384. 388.*
(f) *Defenſ. of ſerm. p. 643.*
(g) *Pro Tortura fort. c. 1.*

be

plaine is expounded.

4. Lastly touching the expositions of the testimonies, let him obserue, that when the words are cleare and their sense manifest, he doe not expound them or wrest them to another meaning. For first, if cleare words must be expounded, there would be no end of expounding. Againe, to what purpose should he expound those words which need no exposition? This is cert, as (h) S. Augustine saith, we shew them to go about to bring darkenesse vnto open light. Besides, Protestants themselues say, that cleare words ought not to be expounded. For thus (i) Luther: The rule (that one place is to be expounded by another) is then made a particular, when a doubtfull or obscure place must be expounded by another that is cleare. For to expound certaine and cleare places by conference of other places is verie ridiculous, and as being stonds into Egypt. The Ministers of Saxony in (k) Colloq. Aldeburg. say to their fellowes, that then onely that exposition is not to be admitted in the replyes. And thole of (l) Zuricke: Scripture is vsed of God, when the words & sense therof is obscure. And Melanchthon: Nothing can be said so properly, so plainly, and wisely, which may not be depraued by some calumnies. Beza (m) also: It is easy to wrest other mens writings. And M. Dominis (n): Let those words which are cleare be kept in their proper and plaine sense.

(h) Serm. 24. de verb. Apost.

(i) Luther. Confut. Carolost.

(k) Pag. 319.

(l) Hospin. fol. 200.

(m) Ep. 42.

(n) l. 2. c. 6.

5. Fourthly let him obserue, that in expounding the Protestants testimonies he doth not hyperboles or figures at his pleasure, but let him bring good reason why he expoundeth them figuratiuely: Luther doth (saith (o) Tertullian) that he so are written, as (o) Cont. who see that that doth not that they ought so be taken as they are written. And the Protestants in Admonit. de lib. Concord. cap. 3. say: if they would not that the should be

vnderstood as they sound, vnles speake they set. And Brentius in Recognit. pag. 148. *What liberty what temerity is this of abusing words and deuising a new Grammer?* For first the rule of vnderstanding mens words is, that they be taken according to their proper and common signification, vnlesse the writer or speaker do by some way declare the contrary. Whereupon (p) Luther sayth; *Where one cannot shew that words are to be taken in their natural sense except the contrary be demonstrated.* And (q) D. Raynolds; *That is the sense of words, in which they are commonly taken.* Besides, otherwise all force of prouing any thing by any words of God or man is quite gone. For sith all the force of such proofs standeth in the sense, if this be vncertaine, and must be proper or figuratiue according as the hearers or readers will, all the force of the proofs shall depend vpon the will of the hearer or Reader. And hence it proceedeth, that the proofes which Catholikes make out of Scripture against Heretikes seeme to some not to conuince the, which falleth out, not for defect in the proofes themselues, but for the manner of the, to wit because they be taken from words, which Heretikes will expound at their pleasure. And if there be no rule obserued in expounding words, but they be wrested at euery ones fancy, what meruaile is there, if Heretikes cannot be conuinced either by the words of Scripture or any other whatsoeuer? Moreouer, if as the will of the Reader or hearer vnder may be expounded either properly or figuratiuely, he that telleth the greatest vntruths, may be thought to tel the greatest truths. & contrariwyse, he that speaketh most impiously, may be iudged to speake most impiously. Hereupon sayd (r) Luther: *If this licence raigne, I may interpret all things fully whatsoeuer either Heretike or the diuell himselfe hath done or*

(p) Tom. 2. fol. 473.

(q) Colloq. c. 8. Diu. 4.

Note.

(r) Tom. 2. fol. 489.

sayd, or can they say for ever. VVhy then shall be the Minister to refell an heretike or the deuill? And (s) againe: If into Luthers play what pleases us, pleasure without yelding any reason, what hindereth but that all Words have new senses? Furthermore, it was the custome of heretikes to accuse figures of their pleasure. Thus (t) S. Athanasius: Heretikes (saith he) accuse figures. And (u) Tertullian: These are the subtilties & sleights of Heretikes to call in question the simplicity of common wordes. And this namely he noteth of the (w) Valentinians, as (x) S. Austin doth of the Priscillianists. And the same condemneth Luther in the Sacramentaries, and the Sacramentaries in the Anabaptists. Finally Protestants themselues condemne this wresting of wordes from their proper signification without iust cause. Luther li cont. Ecchium tom. 1. fol. 354: If words do serue thee in another Mercury at thy pleasure. And fol. 55: To say that Augustin speaketh exceedingly against Heretikes, is to say, that Augustin almost euery where lyed. And Præfat. in Artic. Smalcald. he bitterly inueigheth against some who expounded his words against his meaning. The Ministers of Saxony in Colloq. Aldeburg pag. 343. greatly complaine of the Electorall Ministers, that they miserably crucify Luther with their glosses, and pag. 339. say: It is vncouth to feigne a sense, which the wordes beare not. And pag. 304: VVhosoeuer goeth about to cloak opinions which by themselues or the words sound are false, he is guilty of them, especially if he be a Doctour of the Church and Minister of the word of God. And in like sort the Ministers of the Elector of Saxony pag. 252. that they auoid Luthers words by sophisticall interpretation, and by opposing other places. And pag. 247: Let power be giuen to expound the words Luthers writings according to pleasure and fancy, like the Sybills wrackes or Sphinx his riddles. Besides also Præfat. in Comment. Luther in Genes. tom. 6. fol. 497. that we with

(s) Ib. fol. 220.
(t) Epist. ad Serap.
(u) Contr. Hermog. c. 27.
(x) Præfat.
(y) l. de Hæres.

of Rome: If they fall upon any such places in Luthers interpretations by the clearnesse of which they may be refuted, they forgot that they are figuratively spoken, they devise tropes and figures. And whē the Sacramentaries expounded the words of the Confession of Ausburge commodiously and dextrously, as they speake, according to their opinion, the Lutherans sayd: *May not any in this manner subscribe to the Turkish Alcoran, and make the canons of Trent or other sentences howsoever contrary, to be orthodoxall?* M. Barcroft thus writeth of Puritans: *You must bring strange discords of which these men will not make some harmony.* Againe: To their profit they can make *Quodlibet ex Quolibet*. Pareus lib. 2. de Iustificat. cap. 13. sayth that it *riseth of a naughty cause to depraue the nature of words.* And lib. 4. cap. 1. calleth it a haynous slaunder in Bellarmine, when he sayd that many protestants speak one thing & meane another. The Ministers also of Zurich in Hosp. part. 2. fol. 361. affirme, *That he may iustly be condemned of madnesse of all who giueth credit not to sound and cleare words but to some explication not of him whose the words are but of some other whose they are not.* Yet lee how mad they are to be accounted, who should beleiue not the plaine and euident testimonies of Protestants rehearsed of vs, but some other mens exposition of them. To which I add, that Luther and other Protestants do command, that according to the ciuill law, words be expounded against him, who could speake more clearly, and did not. Seing therefore Protestants could haue vttered their meaning more clearly, if they had meant otherwise then in the forsayd testimonies their words do signify, iustly we may interprete their wordes against them. Lastly Luther according to his own & other mens verdicts did vtter his mind plainly, and did condemne all doubtfull manner of speach in matters

Lobechius Disput. 1. Survey. ca. 17.

Luther to. 2. Colloq. Aldeb. fol. 302. Schuff. to. 4. Catal.

matter of religion. For thus writeth D. Whitaker of him: *He was an open and plaine man.* D. White: *They ſpeake not alwayes ſo plainly as Luther doth.* And Luther himſelfe: *I will be plaine.* Againe: *I had neuer the diſſimulation to pretend to diſpute that which I meant to determine.* And in another place: *I will not abide to be ſuſpected of ſuch hypocriſy, to thinke otherwiſe then I write.* And yet more: *To what is this double-tongued and hateful kind of ſpeach, but vnder words and letters to ſow the ſeed of all hereſies?* The Confeſſion of Saxony cap. 3: *In the Church we muſt auoyd ambiguities.* And Caluin de vera Eccl. reform. pag. 335: *When in all matters plainneſſe is to be vſed eſpecially when religion is handled it is not lawfull to vſe craft and diſſimulations.* And the Sacramentaries in Admonit. de lib. Concordiæ cap. 3. pag. 62: *We endeuour nothing leſſe then to ſeeme to be of one opinion with them with whome we are not.* To conclude howſoeuer it may be, that one or other Proteſtant, in ſome one kind of writing, had written hyperbolically or figuratiuely when he declared it not; yet that ſo many, and ſo principall Proteſtants, ſo often, and in ſo many kind of writings as we haue cited, & in a matter of ſo great moment, ſhould ſpeake hyperbolically or figuratiuely, and yet not declare that they meant ſo, is altogether incredible. Whereſore vnleſſe Proteſtants will ouerthrow the very rule of vnderſtanding mens ſpeaches or words, and make the fancy of the hearer or reader the rule of vnderſtanding them, take away all force of proofes out of any words whatſoeuer, imitate both old and new hereſikes, follow that manner of expounding words which themſelues haue condemned, expound Luther contrary to his owne proteſtation, and confeſſe that Proteſtants in ſo great a matter ſpak one thing and thought another, and finally affirme a thing ſo incredible, as one

Praefat. ad Demonſtr. Sanderi. Deſenſ. c. 33. Tom. 2 fol. 124 215. Epiſt. ad Amſdorf.

Note.

now we shewed this to be, they cannot interprete the foresayd testimonies of Protestants hyperbolically or figuratively, vnlesse they yielde a sufficient reason or proofe thereof. Besides, if in this question of fact they not only reiect the testimonies of Catholikes and of all other men besides their owne, but also expound their owne ment testimonies as they list, they manifestly shew, that in this matter they will heare no testimony nor abide any iudgement whatsoeuer, which is the most euident argument that can be of a naughty cause. For to admit testimonies, not according to the proper sense of the wordes, but to your owne liking, is only to admit the sound or figures of the words, and to reiect the sense or signification, which is the soule and forme of them, and in which alone the force of the testimony or iudgement doth consist.

6. Firstly touching the reason or argument wherewith he will proue, that Protestants in their testimonies by me alleadged meant hyperbolically or figuratively, let him not account it sufficient to shew, that the same Protestants in other places haue sayd the contrary. First, because this will not shew, that they sayd not that which in the places which I cite they most plainly and euidently did say, but only, that according to the manner of Heretikes and lyers they gainesayd themselues. May a man accused of crime expound figuratively his open confession of that crime, because at other times he denyed it? Againe Protestants themselues reiect this kind of proofe. For (as we did see) the Ministers of the Prince Elector did reprehend those of the Duke of Saxony, because they auoyded Luthers testimonies by opposing other places of his. And the Ministers of Saxony

Saxony pag. 303. Lay alls a frivolous kind of argument: He sayd well sometymes, therefore here. Besides, it will be as equall for me to inferre, that Protestants in those testimonies which he produceth, did speake figuratiuely, because in those which I alleage they manifestly sayd the contrary. For to vse Luthers words: *By thy rashnes and licence ye giue your aduersary leaue to turne it against you.* Certainly if they clearly haue layd both, we cannot deny, but they thought both, or ye must confesse, that your pleasure shall be the rule and square to know what they speake properly & what figuratiuely. Moreouer, Protestants crie, that the holy Fathers contradicted themselues. *How often* (sayth Luther) *doe the Fathers fight with themselues. They are men that fight against themselues. Why find the Fathers to haue taught contraries, to haue slumbred.* And Caluin: *The Fathers doe often skirmish amongst themselues, and sometymes fight with themselues.* The like sayth Melanct hon tom. 1. Lutheri fol. 341. Iacobus Andreæ cont. Holium pag. 282. Beza Præfat. in nouum Testamentum and in Schusselburg lib. 4. Theol. Caluin. art. 32. Pareus lib. 2. de Grat. & lib. arbit. cap. 14. & lib. 4. cap. 4. Pelargus part. 1. Thes. de Nota Eccles. Apologia Anglica. And D. Whitaker lib. 4. cont. Durum. Wherefore, either they must shew some priuiledge whereby Protestants be more exempted from contradicting themselues, then the holy Fathers in their opinion were, or they must not inferre, that they sayd not that which they did in place by me alleaged, because otherwhere they sayd the contrary. Furthermore, because both the Fathers and Protestants also (as I shewed in the Preface) doe teach, that Heretikes are wont to contradict themselues. And the Sacramentaries both say and shew by many examples, that

Tom. 2. Assert. Art. 2. & cont. Cochleum. Præfat. Institut.

Tom. 2. fol. 222.

Hosp. lib. 1. fo. 12. Beza in Colloquio. Zuing 10. 2. fol. 422. 458. 400.

Luther oftentymes hath gainsayd himselfe, And of Sacramentaries Schusselburg lib. 1. Theol. Caluin art. 20. writeth: *That it is their property to contradict themselues.*

7. Lastly, touching the weight of the Protestant Confessions which we produce, let him not think, that it is any way impaired in that they haue at other tymes sayd the contrary, as if in this matter they were not to be beleiued, because they haue byn taken in two tales. For the Confessions of those that are accused be of greatest force against themselues, because (as I sayd) no man willingly lyeth against himselfe, neither can these be discredited by any words of theirs spoken in their owne behalfe. For what will it auayle a criminall person, if he deny an hundred tymes the cryme, which he once openly cõfessed. And protestants haue not once, but oftentymes, most plainly, most openly, most freely confessed those things which I allege. Againe, though no credit be to be giuen to a lyer who gainsayth himself in matters for his owne behalfe or against any others, neuertheleſſe in a matter against himselfe, the greatest yea euen the diuels open & free Confession ought more to be credited then any other mans testimony whatsoeuer. Wherfore we allege Protestants sayings not as testimonies, but as Confessions, neither produce them as witnesses, but as Criminals confessing the truth against themselues. And as Saint Ambrose sayd; *I admit not the diuels testimony but his Confession*: so I accept not the Protestants testimonies, but their confessions. Let their testimony be of no credit, either for themselues, or for others, or against others, yndoubtedly it is of great force against themselues. As the Latin Orators sayd: *Thy testimony which in another*

Serm. 1. de Penitē.

mans matter would be light, in mine owne matter, because it is against thy selfe, must weighty. Besides Protestants crie, that it is found to produce the Criminels as witnesses in their owne cause, and that any witnesse in his owne cause is to be reiected. Whereupon in the question of Supremacy they refuse the testimonies of all Popes though never so ancient, never so learned, never so holy. How much better may we reiect the testimonies of Protestants, when they speak in behalfe of their religion, and yet admit their Confessions, when they speake against it. These therefore I owe him answering so iust, so equall, and approued of the Protestats themselues: if he will not keep, who goeth about to answeare my foresayd arguments, it will easily appeare, that in very deed he could not answeare them, And if none endeauour to answeare them, it will yet more appeare, that they can no way answeare them, & that this kind of dealing with Protestants out of their owne Confessions, is the fittest of all to stop their mouthes.

Vorstius Antibel. pag. 442. 443. Iud. Def. part. 2. c. 1. D. 3. Vbiful. cons. 4. q. 6. c. 2. & q. 4. c. 2.

FINIS.

The Translatour to the Reader.

THE Author adioyned hereto a Catalogue of the Protestant Bookes with their seuerall impressions, out of which he gathered the testimonies by him alleaged: but because I thought it not needfull for those that read this English copy, I haue omitted it. The Reader, if he please, may see it in the Authors Latin Copy.

THE

THE INDEX OR TABLE OF THE CHAPTERS CONTAYNED IN THESE BOOKES.

The first booke of the essence or substance of the Protestant Church and Religion.

CHAPTER 1. *That sometymes Protestants admit very few into the Church, and require very many thinges to the making of a member thereof.*

Chap. 2. *That at sometymes Protestants account Papists to be of the Church.*

Chap. 3. *That sometymes Protestants acknowledge all that deny either fundamentall or other articles of*

of fayth Heretikes, Schismatikes, and their professed enemies to be members of their Church.

Chap. 4. *That sometymes they do graunt Idolaters, Infidels, Atheists, and Antichrist himselfe to be members of their Church.*

Chap. 5. *That Protestants sometymes account all their brethren, who vnder the name of Christians, oppose themselues against the Pope.*

Chap. 6. *That it is necessarily required to a Protestant, that he beliene Iustification by only speciall fayth.*

Chap. 7. *That it is also necessary to a Protestant, to beliene all the fundamentall points of Protestancy.*

Chap. 8. *Which are the fundamentall points of Protestancy, and what a Protestant is.*

THE SECOND BOOKE.

Of the Author or beginner of the Protestant Church and Religion.

Chap. 1. THat Protestants confesse, that their Church and Religion was substantially perished when Luther began.

Chap. 2. *The shiftes, wherewith Protestants would delude*

delude their confessions of the false and late deriued Election of their Church and Religion, refuted.

Chap. 3. That Protestants confesse, that all and euery one followed a different Church and Religion from the rest, before Luther began to preach.

Chap. 4. That Protestants graunt that their church and Religion was quite inuisible before Luther appeared.

Chap. 5. Those, which say there were any visible Protestants before Luther, refelled.

Chap. 6. That the Church cannot be so inuisible, as Protestants confesse theirs to haue byn before Luther tymes.

Chap. 7. That Protestants acknowledge, that there were no Protestant Pastors before Luther.

Chap. 8. That the Church cannot be without Pastors.

Chap. 9. That the Protestant Church was no where before Luther arose.

Chap. 10. The Sophistries, wherewith some Protestants would seeme to proue that in tymes past the Protestants Church was in Popery, refuted.

Chap. 11. That all the first knowne Protestants, had byn Papists before tymes.

Chap. 12. That no auncienter Protestant then Luther, kept forth and adioyned himselfe to Luthers company, when he preached securely.

Chap. 13. That the Protestant Church & Religion is new.

Chap. 14. That Protestants doe in plaine termes confesse, that Luther was the Author and beginner of their Church and Religion.
Chap. 15. That Protestants cannot prove by any sufficient Witnes, or any probable argument, that their Church was before Luther.
Chap. 16. What he must observe, who will undertake to answeare this Worke.

FINIS.

3935 L37
L1=4

THE AVTHOR AND SVBSTANCE OF THE PROTESTANT CHVRCH

Written first in Latin by [illegible]
Doctour of Diuinity
Now translated by the Author [illegible]
Into English by [illegible]

THE
[illegible] shall be reduced vnto beginning.
Ecclesiasticus Prologue. cap. 10.

M. DC. XXI.

The Scope of this Worke.

IT both Luther *himselfe, and the famousest Protestants of all sorts, haue many wayes most plainly and most freely confessed, that* Luther *was the* Author *and* Beginner *of the* Protestant Church *and* Religion (*as in this worke doth manifestly appeare*) *then vndoubtedly he was so.*

And if Luther *were the* Author *and* Beginner *therof, assuredly, it was not the* Church *and* Religion *of Christ.*

Read therefore and iudge indifferently; and thereby an end may be made of all Controuersies in Religion *betwixt the* Catholiks *and* Protestants.



THE

THE PREFACE OF THE AVTHOR TO the Reader.

Wherein the manner and profit of this Worke is declared.

THere are two kinds of questions (gentle Reader) which are in controuersy betwixt the Catholikes and Protestantes; the one kind is of fact, to wit, *whether Luther were the author, and beginner of the Protestants Church and Religion; whether before him it were visible and had Pastours, whether he and the first Protestant Preachers were sent by such Pastours, and the like.* The other kind of question is of Christs doctrine or lawe: *For example, whether Christ taught good workes to be necessary to saluation, meritorious, and*

Why a question of Fact is handled rather then of doctrine.

such others. At this present I treate not of this second kind of question, but only of the former and that for three causes. First the questions of Doctrine are innumerable, but the questions of Fact, few. And many haue handled them, and that most exactly, but these, few haue touched, and (for ought that I know) none of purpose hath hitherto written of the Author of Protestancy, and in that manner as I intend to write. Secondly there are few questions of doctrine of that nature, that all other controuersies of faith depend vpon them; but the most questions of Fact are such, as if they be well decided, al other Controuersies of religion are at an end. Such kind of question this especially is, which now I handle, *Whether Luther were Author and beginner of the Protestant church and Religion*. For if it be made manifest, that he was the Author and Beginner of it, euery one will straihgt see that it is not Christs Church & Religion, but Luthers deuise and inuention. Thirdly in questions of doctrine, or law, Protestants want not some pretext of Scripture (as neither any Heretikes wanted) and therfore diuers tymes they are ready to debate these kind of Questions, in which (as Tertullian sayth) *they pretend Scriptures, and with this their boldnes shake some, and in the disputes weary the constant, catch the weake, & send away the middle sort with scruple and doubt*. But in questi-

1.

2.

3.

Præscript. c. 14.

ons

ons of Fact they are destitute not only of al pretence of Scripture, vnles it be some most vaine, but also of all testimony of men and help of reason, and stand only vpon their owne sayinges, & are conuinced by the testimonies of the whol world, and sometyme also by their owne confessions, and therefore are brought to debate these kind of questions no more willingly, then is a theefe to his tryall. Neither do they in these disputs either weary the constant, or catch the weake; but shew their owne weaknes and wilfullnes vnto all kind of men. And this is the cause why Ministers are so loath to dispute of the Church, because the Church, being a company of men, includeth many questions of fact, as of antiquity, succession, continuance, visibility, mission, ordination of Pastours, and such like; in which points there is little colour, or shew on their part.

2. Fourthly, Protestants exact more difficult proofes in questions of doctrine, then they can demand in matters of Fact. For in matters of Fact, wherof the scripture speaketh nothing, they must be content with testimonies of men, against whome no iust exception can be made, or they must refuse all triall of these kind of questions. But in controuersies of doctrine, they account those only to be lawfull proofes, which are taken out of the scripture. Neither

doe theſe ſatiſfie them, vnleſſe they be plaine &
(a) Melan. & Brent. in Hoſpin. fol. 107. Colloq. Ratisb. ſeſſ. 21. (b) Vorſt. reſponſ. ad Slad. (c) Luth. de ſerv. arbitr. fol. 440. Lib. 6. confeſſ. c. 4.
(a) expreſſe, and (as they ſay) word (b) for word containe that which is in queſtion, or at leaſt be ſo pregnant and ſtrong, that they (c) ſtopp all mens mouths that they can gainſay nothing. For it is the common fault of Proteſtants, which S. Auguſtin ſaith, himſelfe was guilty of, whiles he was an heretike, that they will be ascertaine of all things as that ſeauen and three make ten. Nay they yield not alwayes to theſe kind of proofs; For what can be ſayd more expreſſly, more plainly, more literally, then the ſcripture ſaith, that man is iuſtified by workes, and not only by faith; that, that which our Sauiour gaue with his hands to his Apoſtles after his laſt ſupper, was his very body and bloud, and ſuch like: & yet the Proteſtants yield not to theſe kind of teſtimonies, but deuiſe figures and ſhiftes to delude them. Catholiques proofes in controuerſies of doctrine are certainly Theological demonſtrations, becauſe they are clearly drawne from the proper principles of Diuinity, to wit, from cleare words of God confirmed by the tradition of the Church and vnanimous expoſition of the Fathers; which kind of proofe is as great and ſtrong, as either Diuinity or law, or any Science whatſoeuer which is founded in words either doth affoard, or the nature of any law or ſcience which is grounded in words (as

Diuinity

Diuinity is) can beare or affoard. And as the Philosopher saith well, it were starck madnes to exact any other kind of proofes of any Profession, then the nature therof can affoard. But becausse heretiques expound what words soeuer as they list, and litle set by the authority of the Church or Fathers, and the vnlearned hardly perceaue what kind of proofe is a Theologicall demonstration, & such as Diuinity can affoard no greater, or which is the true sense of Gods word, or how great the authority of the Churh and Fathers ought to be; therefore with them, Catholiks proofs in points of doctrin, albeit in truth they be Theological demonstrations, take litle effect. Wheras on the other side Catholique proofes in matter of Fact, are not only Theologicall, but also (that I may so speake) Mathematicall demonstrations, becausse they consist of one principle which is grounded not only vpon the foundations of Diuinity, to wit the word of God together with the exposition of the Church and Fathers, but also is manifest by the light of reason: which kind of principles these are, *That Gods Church hath alwayes bin: that it is one: that it is the auncientest of all Churches: that it is alwayes visible: hath alwayes Pastors*, and the like; And of another principle, which may be tryed by our sense and experience, as that the foresayd properties agree neither to the Protes-

1. Eth. 2.

tants nor to the Anabaptists, nor to any hereticall company. And therefore these kind of demonstrations moue euen the most obstinate heretiques, and are euident euen to the most ignorant and vnlearned persons.

3. And hence ariseth a fift cause of handling rather questions of Fact then of doctrin, because the fruit of debating those questions is reaped with more facility and of far more. For whereas few but diuines do themselues perceaue the true meaning of the testimonyes of Scripture wherewith the questions of doctrin are debated; as the true meaning of the law, few but lawyers themselues do see; all perceaue the meaning of those testimonyes wherwith the questions of fact are disputed, who will afoard an attentiue eye to see, or eare to heare. And heerupō Casaubon wrote, *that for to insinuate into the mind of the Reader any opinion now in controuersie, Baronius hystoryes are of greater force, then Bellarmines disputes*. And sayd also someryme, as one most worthy of credit, who heard him, told me, that whiles he read Bellarmines disputations, he began to doubt of all Religion, but whiles he perused Baronius Annales, he felt himselfe by little & little drawn towards Papistry: which thing might wel haue befallen him and such others, not because Cardinall Bellarmine proueth lesse soundly, for the nature of the matter, the truth of Catholik Religion

Epist. dedicat. exercit. cont. Baron.

D. Flaminis.

ligion in questions of doctrine, then Cardinall Baronius doth the same in questions of Fact, but because such is the nature of the testimonyes, wherewith the truth of Catholike fayth in questions of doctrine is proued, that they are lesse euident then the testimonyes wherewith the Catholike truth in matters of Fact is proued, and also haue many thinges which seeme to be contrary and repugnant to them. Whereupon it falleth out that some hearing or reading controuersies of doctrine disputed between Catholikes and Heretikes, and not being able of themselues to discern betwixt truth & shew of truth, either follow neither party, but become vncertaine or Atheistes, or content with any shew of truth take that part to which any affection of their will doth draw them. Whereas none by hearing or reading controuersies of Fact becommeth not more confirmed in the Catholik faith or more auerted from heresy. And therefore Tertullian counsaileth vs, not to dispute with Heretikes out of Scripture, by which questions of doctrine are disputed, but aduiseth vs to appeale to antiquity, succession, and such like which concerne questions of fact. Præscrip. cap. 19.

4. Lastly, though the fruit of disputing both those kind of questions were equall, yet fifth the Author, by order of nature, goeth before the thing whereof he is Authour, according to

the order of Nature we ought to intreate of the Author of Protestancy before we dispute of Protestancy it selfe. For (as well sayth Tertullian) *nothing but God alone is without beginning which how much it goeth before in the state of all things, so much ought it to go before in the handling of them, that the state may be knowne.* And other where: *Nothing is knowne before the beginning is knowne.* Wherfore I will begin my first dispute concerning the Protestant Religion of the Authour thereof: Yet before I do that, I must set downe and determine what a Protestant, or the Protestant Church and Religion is, and what is necessary for one to be a Protestant, and discouer the vncertainty of Protestants. And this much touching the matter which I haue made choice of to handle in this little worke and the causes thereof.

Lib. 5. cont Mar.

Lib 3 cont Mar.

VVhy proued only out of Protestants.

5. As for the manner wherwith I vndertake to discusse this question of Fact, whether Luther was the first Author & beginner of the Protestant Church, and Religion, I purpose to proue it only out of the confessions of Luther himselfe, and of the three sorts of Protestants, to wit, Lutherans, who professe to follow Luther in all points of doctrine; Sacramentaries, who notoriously dissent from him touching the reall presence of Christs body in the Sacrament; and our English Protestants, who differ from both

both the former at leaſt in diſcipline & gouer-
ment of their Church: becauſe this kind of
proofe out of their owne wordes I find to be
both neceſſary and moſt effectuall with Prote-
ſtants. Neceſſary, becauſe of this queſtion
of Fact, neither the Scripture, or the Fathers Neceſſary.
ſay any thing, as alſo, becauſe, ſeeing Pro-
teſtants deny part of the ſcripture, and in-
terprete the reſt as they pleaſe, and will not
ſtand to the ſentence of the Church, Councels,
or Fathers, account reaſon Sophiſtrie, & con-
temme the teſtimonies of Catholique writers,
they haue left nothing but their own cõfeſſiõs,
by which we may diſpute with them. And I
pray God they do giue place to their own moſt
frequent and moſt plaine confeſſions, and not
delude them by voluntary and friuolous inter-
pretations; for then hope may be, that there
wilbe ſome end of theſe controuerſies. At leaſt
we ſhall reape this profit by this labour, that
by it ſhall be manifeſt to all, that either Proteſ-
tants will beare no teſtimony, admit no iudge-
ment, no not their owne, which is a moſt eui-
dent argument of a moſt deſperat cauſe; or that
they ſhall be condemned by their owne verdict
& ſentence; or laſtly that there can be no forme
of ſpeech ſo plaine, no words ſo cleare, no ſen-
tence ſo manifeſt, which they with their faig-
ned figures & deuiſes will not wreſt, fruſtrate,

and

and delude; which is in effect to disanull al kind of proofe which is taken out of words or testimonies whatsoeuer. For I will bring so plaine testimonies of theirs, as plaine can scarce or not at all be deuised; I will bring so many, as themselues will require no more; I will bring so weighty, as themselues will demaund none more weighty; I wil bring them also most freely and often iterated and repeated; lastly I will bring not only those which indirectly and by consequence proue that which I would, but those also, & that especially & oftenest, which directly testify that which they are brought to confirme. Wherfore either they will not delude these words of theirs, or they wil delude all wordes whatsoeuer; And either they will not refuse these their owne testimonies and confessions, or they will reiect all testimonies and iudgements whatsoeuer, which is in effect to confesse that their cause is most desperate and most worthy to be reiected and condemned of all.

Most effectuall.

By reaso.

This maner also of proofe is most effectuall, for what can be of greater force to conuince a man, then his owne iudgement and acknowledgement of the truth? Surely vnlesse a man will professe himselfe to be an enemy of truth, and of the number of them who see good and follow bad, he must needs imbrace that

truth

truth which himselfe confesseth. Experience also sheweth the same. For when our Saviour could neither by infinite miracles nor evident scriptures stop the mouthes of the Iewes, he so convinced them out of their owne words, that (as the Euangelist writeth) *they answered him not a word, nor from that day any durst aske him a question.* And the Donatists, when they made no answeare to the Catholikes arguments taken out of scripture, were so intangled in their owne fact touching the Maximinists, as (sayth S. Augustine) *they cast more stones dumbe at that.* And now we see, that Protestants are tongue-tied at no sort of bookes so much, as at those, which are composed of their owne testimonies. This manner of dealing vsed the holy Fathers against the Pagans, as is to bee seen in Clement, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, Augustin, and others; and against heretiques also, as appeareth in the sayd S. Augustin. S. Hierome, and others, most often, and the same they most highly commend. For thus writeth (c) S. Denis of Alexandria: *It helpeth me much, that I can disprove them out of their owne wordes.* S. (d) Gregorie Nazianzen: *It is the greatest cunning and wisdome of speach to bind (the Aduersary) with his owne wordes.* And (e) Tertullian, or Nouatian: *It is a strong kind of proofe, which is taken of the aduersary*

By experience. (f)

Hist. &c.

(d) In collat. 3. cap. 1.

By the Fathers.

(c) Apud Euseb. lib. 7. c. 6.

(f) Orat. de S. Basil.

(e) De Trinit. c. 29.

uersary, that truth may be proued euē by the enemyes of truth. S. (g) Ireneus: *We often disgrace them by their owne doctrine.* And (i) S. Augustine: *Neither will I bring against thee any other sentences for to shew the errour of Manichee, then out of thyne owne epistle*: Which worke of his he (k) preferreth before al the other which he wrote against that heresy. Nay, the same holy Fathers account this manner of dealing with heretiks necessary, and preferre it before all others. For thus sayth S. Ireneus (l) *It is needfull to disprone the Valentinians by their Mothers, Fathers and Ancestours.* And in another (m) place: *That is a true and vnanswerable proofe which bringeth attestation frō the aduersaryes themselues.* And (n) Tertullian: *The aduersaryes testimony is ofttimes necessary.* Againe: *I must strike them with their own weapons.* And (o) S. Athanasius, who was most tryed in combates with heretikes: *Against wranglers we must oppose their owne arguments, in which* (sayth he) *I haue the greatest hope of victory.* S. Chrysostome (p) also: *We must conuince them by this, when we turne their owne ill sayings against themselues, as often as we make those who were the famousest amongst them, their accusers.* And lastly (q) S. Augustine the most fortunate champion of the Church against heretiks seeing that the Donatists could be euidently conuinced by their owne dealing with the Maximinists, exhorteth

(g) Lib. 2. cap. 53.
(i) Lib. cont. Secund. c. 3.
(k) Lib. 2. Retract. c. 20.
(l) Lib. 2. cap. 35.
(m) Lib. 4. c. 14.
(n) Lib. de anima c. 3.
(o) Athan. de carne Christi.
(p) Hom. 3. in epist. ad Tit.
(q) Lib. 1. cons. Gaud. 4. 27.

horteth Catholikes to let alone all other kind of arguments, and still to vrge this only: *Remember* (saith he) *this only fault of the Maximinists, cast this in their faces, answere to al obiections by the Maximinists alone.* And (t) againe: *I will not leaue this only fault which God hath put before their eyes to stop their mouthes, and to amend them if they be wise, or to confound them if they remayne obstinate.* (t) Ibid. cap. 18.

And in like manner, when he saw, that the Donatists cause was quite ouerthrowne by that saying of theirs: *Neither one cause doth preiudice another, nor one person another*, he thus speaketh vnto Catholiques: (u) *I request you, I beseech you for Christs sake, that you remember it, speake it, and haue it euer in your mouthes. There could not be pronounced on our behalfe, a briefer, surer, and plainer sentence.* Thus you see how greatly the Fathers esteeme of this kind of dealing with heretikes, and how earnestly they vrge vs for to vse it. (u) Serm. 12. de verb. Apostol.

7. And Protestants ought the more to allow this kind of proceeding with them, because they much commend it, and preferre it before all others. Luther: *There* (x) *is no stronger proofe, then his owne confession, who is accused, and his testimony against himselfe.* And againe: *No* (y) *man can convince a lyer better then by his owne words.* Heshusius: *The* (z) *shortest way of al to conuince an aduersary is that whi. bis taken out of his owne confession,* (x) De seruo arbit. fol. 442. (y) Inc. 1. 1. Pet. fol. 448. (z) Lib. de Cœna.

(y) Epist. Bucer. ... *confession, wherwith he openly acknowledgeth that what is obiected* Lucas (z) Oliander: *The confession and testimony of the aduersary is of greatest authority*: Peter (a) Martyr: *Surely amongst other testimonyes that is of greatest weight, which is giuen by the enemies*. D Bancroft: *Let* (b) *vs take hold of that which they haue graunted. You may be bold to build vpon it for a truth, that they are so constrayned to yield vnto*. D (c) Whitaker: *It must needs be a strong argument, which is taken out of the confession of the Aduersaryes. For the testimony of the aduersaryes is of force against themselues*. And (d) againe: *It is a notable matter and encreaseth much to the triumph for to be proued by the testimony of the aduersaries*. And D Morton in the Epistle dedicatory of his answere to the Protestants Apology: *Which kind of assistance of learned aduersaryes the Apologists themselues haue layd down for the greatest reason of satisfaction, & we do accordingly admit*. Nay, they begin to vse this kind of arguing against vs, and vaunt much therof: *Who may not* (sayth the sayd. D. (e) Morton) *iustly congratulate the Protestants happines, whose truth it selfe proceeding out of their aduersaries mouths doth patronize*?

(z) Loc. cit. de Iudic. fol. 3. vers.

(a) Survey c. 8. pag. 242.

(b) Cont. 2. c. 14.

(c) Praef. in Cont.

(d) Apol. 1. cap. 1. Differences betwixt Protestants maner of dealing & ours.

8. But, by their leaue, there are many and great differences betweene their and our kind of proceeding in this matter. First many of the Catholikes, whome they produce against vs, wrote

wrote before their Religion was risen, & therefore we answere that of them, which S. Hierom answered of the ancient Fathers, who liued before Arius appeared: *Before Arius* (sayth he) *arose in Alexandria like a noon-tide Diuell, they spake some things innocently and not so warily, which cannot escape the obloquie of peruerse men.* And which S. Augustin answered of S. Chrysostom when the Pelagians alleadged his testimony. *Discoursing* (sayth he) *in the Catholike Church, he thought not that he was otherwise vnderstood. None was yet troubled with such a question; you not yet iangling, he spake more securely.* But the Protestats which we produce liued al after that protestancy was both bred and hatched, & after the Catholike fayth had for many ages shined through out the world, and therfore could not be ignorant what wordes of theirs might make for the Catholike fayth, and preiudice their owne cause. Another difference is, that none of the Catholikes whose testimonyes Protestants alleage against vs, is accounted of vs for a man sent extraordinarily of God, and much lesse for a Prophet, Euangelist, or Apostle. Nay, many of them are obscure writers, and of small or no reckoning among vs, some of them are not held for Catholikes of vs, and some of them euen by the iudgments of Protestants themselues are our open enemyes. But the confessions of fayth

Lib. 1. contr. Ruffin.

Lib. 1. cont Iul. c. 6.

Cassander Erasmus. Cornelius Agrippa. Matth of Padua.

Beatus Rhenanus Faber Stapulensis, Orthuinus Gratius.

which we cite against Protestāts containe their faith, so that they cannot be reiected of them, vnles they will renounce their fayth. And of the men whose testimonyes we produce, one is accounted of them a (e) God, another a Prophet an (f) Euangelist, an Apostle, a third Elias, an Angell. His writings are held for inspired from heauen, for a rule of fayth, and equall to the writinges of the Apostles. Another is called a (g) great and admirable Prophet, others are esteemed for lights, lampes, bright starres, props, founders, parents, renewers of the Protestants church and religion. Others are men extraordinarily sent and diuinely raised to lighten the world; most of them for very learned, famous & well deseruing of the Protestant religion; & finally all for sincere Protestants. The holy Fathers were wont to refute both the (h) Pagans superstition and the (i) heretikes errours out of the Diuels confessions. Of which kind of proof (k) Tertullian, vsing it, maketh this account: *What more manifest then this fact? what more sure then this proofe? Beleeue them, they speake true of themselues, who vse to credit them when they lye. No man lyeth to his owne disgrace.* And S. (l) Cyprian: *Who so seyest that thou worshipest the Gods beleeue euen them whom thou worshippest.* And likewise Minutius in Octauio: *Neither do they lye to their owne shame, especially if some of you be by.* Beliue

(e) Humf. ad Rat. 4. Camp.
(f) Colloq. Aldebur. Schusselb. Catal. 13. Huius præfat. de liber. arbit.
(g) Sanc. lib. 4. de Eccles. c. 9. Beza ep. 6.
(h) Iustin. dial. cum Tryphon. Auguſt. l. de ciuit. Chryſoſt. hom. 26. in 2. Cor. Cyril. 4, 6. in Iulian.
(i) Hier. cont. Vigilant. Ambroſ. ſerm. 3. de Sanctis. Hilar. l. 2. & 6. de Trinit.
(k) Apol. cap. 22.
(l) Lib. ad Demetr.

Beue themselues witnessing that they are Diuels, and confessing the truth of themselues. But our proofe taken out of the Protestants confessions of faith & out of Luther & such like famous Protestants testimony against Protestancy, is much more euident and stronger; both because it is more likely that men will confesse the truth, though against themselues, then the Diuell the father of lyes and sworne enemy of truth; as also because the confessions of the Diuel were extorted from him by force, as the Fathers themselues doe acknowledge, but these of Luther and his mates come moist freely from them. Beleiue therefore (O Protestants) your chiefe leaders, your founders, Instructors Prophets, Euãgelists, & Apostles, in that which they freely & of their own accord cõfesse of themselues & of their doctrine. Euen by the testimony of your own Prophets & teachers beleiue, that Protestãcy is newly risen, first founded by Luther, & before knowne to none. No man willingly lyeth to his owne shame; no man freely confesseth that which ouerthroweth his owne cause, but which he cannot deny. No man knew protestancy better then they, no man fauoured it more then they. *Who* (layth Caluin) *is to be credited touching Popery, more then the Pope himselfe?* And whom shal we beleiue touching the author and hatching of protestancy amongst the Lutherans, rather then Luther

Note.

De ver. Eccles. form.

Luther himselfe, Melanchon, the Centurywriters, Kemnice, Schusselburg, and the like? Or amongst the Sacramentaryes, rather then Zuinglius, Bullinger, Bucer, Peter Martyr, Caluin, Beza, Plessie, and such others? or amongst English Protestants rather then Iewell, Fox, Whitaker, Fulke, Humfrey, Perkins, and the like, whose frequent and plaine confessions we heerin produce. A third difference between our and the Protestants manner of proceeding in this kind of proofe is, that Protestantes oftentymes alleadge Catholikes testimonyes corrupted, mangled, and falsifyed; and sometymes also the obiections which they make against thē-selues, insteed of their answeres, as Cardinall Peron not long since shewed Plessie to haue don before the French King, euen by the iudgment of Protestant themselues. And it were eaſy to demonstrate that D.(m) Morton hath done the like in his Apology. But I produce the testimonyes of Protestants certaine and entiere, at least for that sense for which I alleadge them. For I haue cited none in this worke which either I haue not seene with myne owne eyes, and for the most part haue quoted not only the bookes and chap ters but also the leaues and pages, or if I haue wanted the booke, I haue cited them out of some good Author. The fourth difference & that of great moment is, that the Catholiques, whose

conference at fountaine Bel-eaue.

(m) Apol. *part.1.l.1. c.23. l.2.c. 41. part.2. l.c.35. l.2. c.41.*

whose testimonyes Protestants alleadge against is (if so be they were true Catholikes) were alwayes ready to reuoke and recall whatsoeuer they had written contrary to the catholik fayth, & to submit all their wordes or writings to the centure of the catholike Church, which to be the mind & disposition of all Catholiks, Protestants themselues confesse. For thus writeth D. (n) Whitaker: *This is the condition, this the consent of the Popish Church, that all hang their saluation vpon one man, and submit themselues to one mans iudgment.* And D. (o) Morton: *Is there any Papist that thinkes any decree of the Pope can be contemned or broken without cryme or heresy?* Which sith it is so, in vaine do they obiect any Catholikes words against the Catholike fayth. For either they are not contrary thereto, or if they be, they are already reuoked, recalled and disanulled by himselfe. But the mind and proceeding of Protestats is far otherwise, who subiect not their opinions to the iudgment of the Church, but as they thinke that she may erre, so will they hold their opinions notwithstanding her sentence to the contrary; and therfore iustly maywe produce their testimonies against their owne Church.

(n) Contr. 2. q. 5. c. 8.

(o) Apol. part. 1. l. 1. cap. 31.

9. The fift difference, & which is much to be noted, is, that Protestants alleadge Catholik witnesses in matters of doctrin, in which some

August l. 11. cont. Faust. c. 5.

tymes by reason of the obscurity of the matter a man may chance to erre & slip or els in such matters of fact, as were in times or places far distant from them, so that themselues could not search the truth, but beleeued the reports of others. Such a question is that of Pope *Ioane*, in which Protestants cite no Catholike author which liued not some ages after that time, wherin Pope *Ioan* is sayd to haue beene. Or if they produce any Catholike Author in any matter of fact, the truth wherof he might haue tried, either he is of no credit, or the matter is such, as it turneth to no preiudice of the Catholike faith. But we heer produce Protestants in a matter of fact, & such a matter as they could most easily know. For what was more easy, then for Luther and his fellowes to try either then or euer since, whether, when he first began, there was in the world any Protestant company, whether it were visible, whether it had Pastours, and the like? For who can thinke, that only the Protestant company could lye so close hid, that neither in all Luthers time or euer since, either he being, or the estate or condition, or place or Pastours, or any thing at all therof could be espied out of so many Argoses, which now in one whole age haue sifted all corners of the world to find it out? And besides, this is such a question of Fact, as vpon the decision therof

an

an end may be made of all cõtrouersies betweene Catholikes and Protestants. For (as I layd before) if Luther be the Author and beginner of the Protestant Church, it is certaine, that it is not the Church of Christ, nor to be followed of Christians, but to be forsaken & detested. To which I ad now, that if Luther himself & such & so many learned & famous Protestãts as I haue cited, do by many wayes, & so plainly confesse, that Lutherwas the Author therof, it cannot be doubted, but that he was in truth the Author of it. For I alleadge not men of small credit among Protestants, but such as are of greatest authority with them; nor a few, but many; nor of one nation alone, but of diuers, to wit, Germans, Italians, French, English, Scottes, Flemings and others; nor Protestants of one sort or sect, but of all three namely Lutherans, Sacramẽtaries and English Protestants. So that they could not beare false witnesse in this matter either for wãt of knowledge, becausethey were many and learned & of different countries, and most diligent in searching the matter, and the matter it selfe most easy; nor for want of good will towards the cause, becausethey were all most earnest Protestants. And to refuse the testimonies of such witnesses in a matter of fact, in their owne time, so easy to be knowne, and so diligently Note.

ſearched of them, what other thing is it, then obſtinately to refuſe to know the truth of this matter ſo important to be knowne, and whereby may be made an end of all contentions in Religion? Wherfore let Proteſtants ſay as they
Note. pleaſe, that in queſtions of doctrine they will not depend vpon Luther, Calvin, or any one, or all their doctours together, but vpon the ſcripture alone: Neuertheles in matter of fact, wherof the ſcripture ſaith nothing, ſuch as this is (for the Scripture telleth not what was the ſtate and condition of the Proteſtant Church when Luther began, in what place it was, what Paſtours it had, who ſaw it, and the like) either they muſt confeſſe, that they refuſe all triall & knowledge of ſo important a truth, or they muſt giue credit to the depoſition of ſufficient witneſſes. And if euer men were or can be ſufficiet witneſſes of any matter of Fact, Luther and thoſe Proteſtants which here I produce, are ſufficient witneſſes of that which I bring them for to teſtify. And thus much touching the cauſe why I proue Luther to haue been the founder of Proteſtant Religiō only by the teſtimonies of Proteſtants.

Why ſo many Proteſtants teſtimonyes are alleaged.

10. As for the reaſon why I alleadge ſo many Proteſtants, that is, that it many appeare that it is not the priuate teſtimony of ſome one or few, but the generall conſent of them all, o

at leaſt the common ſentence of many of them. And if I ſeeme to any Catholike ouer tedious in heaping vp ſo many teſtimonies of Proteſtants, I pray him to cõſider, that I write not this book to Catholikes to confirme them in the Catholike faith, who I know to that end doe not need the teſtimonies of Proteſtants; but that I write it partly to Catholikes, for to furniſh them with ſtore of Proteſtants teſtimonies to ſtopp their mouthes, and to ſhew them that they are right Heretikes, that is, condemned (as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh) by their owne iudgement, to which end a few teſtimonies of theirs would not ſuffice. And therfore to ſuch as intend this end the multitude of teſtimonies will not be troubleſome. For who, that indeauoureth vãquiſh moſt obſtinate enemies, will complain of the abundance of good ſoldiers wherof he may make choice? And if I had rehearſed only ſome few teſtimonies, and named the places where the reſt may be found, ſome would haue cauilled, as M. Iewel did againſt D. Harding, that I had cited dumbe witneſſes. Beſides, ſeing the iudgments of men are diuers, it may fall out, that what kind of teſtimonyes ſeem ſtrong & forcible to ſome, others acount but weake and litle to the purpoſe; and therfore it was behofull, that there ſhould be as it were a ſtore-houſe of Proteſtants teſtimonies, that euery one might

take what weapon he thinketh fittest for him, & vse it against them. But especially I gathered these testimonies of Protestants for the Protestants themselues, that by their owne mens iudgement I might withdraw them from their errour. And therfore I was not so fearfull to bring too many for Catholikes, as carefull to prouide inough for Protestants. In which I could hardly offend by multitude. For as S. (p) Vigil saith, *Mans mind possessed with the errour of a false opinion, is hard and slow to perceiue truth, with how many witnesses soeuer it be vrged therto.* Or as (q) Tertullian writeth: *much talke in matter of edification is not foule if at any time it be foule.* And (r) S. Hierom: *delay is no losse, when by delay the victory is more assured.* Wherupon S. Augustin counsaileth vs, not to regard and delay whatsoeuer, so we bring good proofe of what we say. Besides, (s) Protestants deny that we ought to iudge of them by one or few; though they be Pastors, and (u) write that M. Brierly in his Protestants Apologie, although it be stuffed with all kind of Protestants testimonies, hath brought but a few testimonies. And as S. (x) Augustin saith of the Donatists, they *are ready to deny vvhat they can.* Or as S (y) Hierome speaketh: *Shutting their eyes deny vvhat they would vvere not.* For what could be more impudently denyed, then that which D. (z) Field denyeth

(p) Lib. 1. de Pasions.
(q) Lib. 1. cont. Iou.
(r) De gestis cum Emerit.
(s) V V bi. cont. 295. c. 17. l. 2. de script. c. 11. sect. Sadeel. in Refut. Posnan. c. 12.
(u) White in defence of his way. c. 7.
(x) Lib. 3. cont. Cresc. c. 6.
(y) Epist. ad Ctesiph.
(z) Lib. 3. de Eccles. c. 8. 49.

denieth that when Luther began, the publique and generall face of Religion in the Westerne Church was Papisticall? These men need haue their mouthes shut, and their eares stopt with multitude of testimonies. For as (a) Caluin saith) *it is the part of wicked & furious obstinacie, to discredit so many and so authentical testimonies.* Or as an (b) other sayth: *If in a matter of great importance one only witnes were alleadged, what place would his testimony find? But vnder so many and so great witnesses as are heere produced, all pretexts of not receauing the truth is taken away. In so great certainty of so many witnesses, how is there so great loue of darknes, that they open not their eyes to see the light?* To which I add that saying of Varius in (c) Cicero: *Either these witnesses will suffice, or nothing will suffice.* Neuertheless, that I might both somewhat ease the wearines of Catholikes in reading so many testimonyes, and better set before the eyes of Protestants the force of their testimonyes, I doe for the most part marke in the margent those testimonyes which are most forcible, & after I haue recited them all, I gather the force and summe of them togeather which he may read, who loatheth to runne ouer so many,

(a) *Instit. 3. c. 23. §. 3.*

(b) *Præfa. Symb. conf.*

(c) *Lib. 2. de finibus.*

Why many testimonyes of the same mā.

11. I bring also diuers testimonies of the same Protestants, especially of Luther, that it may appeare, that that confession slipt not from him

him vnawares and vnaduisedly, but that it was his constant iudgement, if there can be any constancy in heretikes. For I remember that (d) Beza, for to couer Caluins foule contradictiõs of himselfe, wrote; *As if of that vvhich one hath vvritten briefly in some place, vvere to be gathered vvhat he thought of euery point of doctrine.* I graunt notwithstanding, that I haue brought some testimonies which are not so cleare, as of themselues they would conuince the matter; Yet such they are as strengthen those that are cleare, and of them receiue light. For as in gathering an armie not only stout men but also some other are chosen, who may increase the strength of those that are stout, and likewise may be encouraged by them; so it fareth also in gathering testimonies. Neither yet did I gather all that occurred: but only such as seemed more to the purpose. It will also delight the reader to see how some Protestants plainly and roundly confesse the truth, others deale more craftily & closely, and in them he shal espy that difference which S. Austin (e) noted betwen Celestius, and Pelagius, of whome he writeth, *that he vvas more opẽ this more close, he more obstinate this more false, he more free, this more wily*. If any aske how it fell out, that Protestãts should giue such plain testimonies against their own cause; I answere, that there were many causes heerof. First the euidence

(d) Præfat. opusc. Cal.

Loberinus præfat. disput. VVhitak. ad Demonstrat. Saunderi.

(e) Lib. de pecc. at. origin. c. 12.

uidece of truth, which maketh its enemies, yea the deuils themselues sometimes to confesse it: *The very coyners of lyes* (sayth (f) S. Basil) *often tymes catcht with the euidence of truth, as with a snare, euen against their wills do witnes it.* Againe, *It is the nature of lyes to bewray themselues*, like (g) as Tertullian writeth: *The lyes commonly leaue some thing behind them, which bewrayeth them.* For as S. Augustine (h) sayth: *It is incredible, that he should not be taken by lyes, who lyeth to take others.* Or as S. Basil (i) hath: *So it is, that euill is not only contrary to good but also to it selfe.* And Luther (k) himselfe: *There is no heretike, who is not found of spirituall men to speak against himself in his lyes.* And els where: *This happeneth to the wicked, that by lying they cannot beware not to bewray themselues by their wordes. They lye some while and some tymes, but continually they cannot. At last lyes bewray themselues especially with them who marke and obserue. For there escapeth some word from them with which they are taken.* The same confesse (l) Caluin, (m) Beza, (n) Whitaker, and others. Another cause is, because Protestants (as heretiques are wont to do, and (o) themselues confesse that they practise it) accommodate their sayings and doctrine to time, place, and occasions, & therfore vtter those sayings which we here alleadge, before whome and when they thinck they will make to their purpose; but

(f) Lib. 2. cont. Eun.

(g) Lib. 5. cont. Mar.

(h) In sentenc. Prosp. (i) Lib. 2. cont. Eun.

(k) In cap. 22. Mat. in cap. 4. & 37. Genes.

(l) Resp. ad Nebul. & admon. 11.

(m) Cont. Castel. p. 421.

(n) Cont. 2. q. 2. c. 3. & q. 5. c. 8.

(o) Zuin. de relig. c. de Euch. Hospin. part. 2. fol. 90. colloq. Aldeb fol. 134. Schusselb. tom. 7. catal. p. 130.

where

where they see they will hurt their cause, either they deny them, or seeke by friuolous and fond expositions to auoyd and delude them. So the Donatists (as (p) Augustin noteth) would not confesse that, which would haue confounded them, when the Catholikes vrged it, *but after when an other point was in handling*. A fourth cause may be giuen, that as the Scorpion affordeth a remedy for her sting, and of the vipers flesh is made the counterpoyson; so God hath ordayned, that heretiques affoard sufficient meanes to refute their errors: *Neither yet therfore* (as S. (q) Augustin writeth) *giue we any thanks to them, but to God alone. For that they should for our cause produce & discouer all these things by speaking or writing, truth enforced them, not charity inuited them.* And (r) Luther himselfe: *So must the enemies of truth confound and mock themselues for a reward of their blasphemies*. And (s) againe: *Since God ordayneth that folly is alwayes ioyned with malice, Cain bewrayeth himselfe. And for this cause the defence of truth is easy against the aduersaries therof*. Wherupon (t) Hospinian thus writeth of the Lutherans: *They are become grieuous enemyes and aduersayes, not so much of others, as of themselues; surely by a most euident testimony of Gods iudgment, and worthy punishment and confusion for these kind of ambitious and contentious men*. Which I would God Protestants would obserue,

(p) *Lib. ad Donat. post collat.*

(q) *Supr. c. 33.*

(r) *Cont. R. Angl. fol. 34.*

(s) *In cap. 4. Genes.*

(t) *Hospi. part. 2. histor. fol. 39.*

obserue, not in Lutherans only, but also in other Protestants. For they should find, that they haue no heauier aduersaries then themselues: & that Protestants (as (u) Lactantius wrote of Cicero) cannot be more surely confused, then they are by Protestants themselues.

(u) Lib. 2. c. 9.

Faultes

Faults eſcaped in the printing.

Page	Line	Fault	Correction
81.	11.	himelf	himſelfe
82.	27.	vnles be	vnles be be
96.	6.	numb. 66.	numb. 96.
107.	19.	The	There
109.	23.	light of	*dele* of
120.	4.	credible	incredible
127.	7.	the	theſe
131.	6.	*dele*	haue bin
137.	2.	be	be by
140.	6.	fourth	third
147.	33.	waye	waxe
154.	7.	In	is
168.	23.	ſonde	ſponge
169.	3.	one	our
170.	33.	1585.	1535.
181.	24.	ſhould only	ſhould only ſay
184.	27.	predigious	prodigious
205.	31.	boaſteth	boaſteth that
219.	vlt.	Taye	Faye
221.	33.	of fayth	faith of
222.	21.	firſt	fifth.

If any other faults haue eſcaped, it is deſired of the Gentle Reader, to correct them of his courteſy, the Author being far abſent from the Print.

THE

THE FIRST BOOKE.

Of the ſubſtance of the Proteſtants Church and Religion, and of their uncertainty therein.

CHAP. I.

BECAVSE, as after Plato and Ariſtotle, Tully ſayth very truly: *Whoſoever will according to the order of reaſon treat of any thing, muſt firſt define or explicate the nature thereof, that it may be knowne what it is whereof he ſpeaketh*; and Proteſtants agree, that the definition is *the very ground of all diſputation*; before I do ſhew, who was the firſt author of the Proteſtant Church and Religion (which I will do in the ſecond booke) I will in this firſt define and determine what is a Proteſtant, and what is the Proteſtant Church and Religion. And becauſe Proteſtants in this matter (as in all others) are variable and inconſtant, ſometymes requiring many things to the making and conſtitution of a Proteſtant, & ſometymes being content with very

Lib. 1. offic.

Calvin. 3. Inſtitut. cap. 4. §. 2. Sadel. in Refut. Theſ. Poſnan. cap. 22

few things, sometyms stretching the bounds of their Church most largly, otherwhiles drawing the very strait, according as it serueth to their present purpose; I will first discouer this their vncertainty about so weighty a matter, & afterward out of their owne principles and confessions of fayth, set downe what is indeed necessary to the very substance and being of a Protestant, and of their Church and Religion. And in this Chapter I will shew, how few they sometymes do admit to be of the Church, and how many things they require to the making of a Protestant; and in some chapters following, how many they at other tymes do graunt to be of their Church, and how few things they account necessary for to be a member thereof. That done I will make manifest, what is indeed necessary thereto.

They exclude Papists.

2. First of all therefore they sometymes exclude Catholiques, (whome they terme Papists) out of the Church, as is manifest by all their writings, in so much that the French Protestants in the 28. article of their confession say: *We openly affirme that where the word of God is not receiued, nor there is any profession of obedience due thereto, nor any vse of Sacraments, there, properly speaking, we cannot iudge to be any Church. Wherfore we condemne the Popish Conuenticles.* And D. Whitaker in his second booke against Dureus & 2. section, is so earnest that he sayth: *I will not allow the very name of a lawfull Church vnto the Roman Church, because it hath nothing, which a true Church ought to haue.* And both he in his 2. Controuerly 6. question 3. Chapter, *De Sutline* in his first booke of the Church 3. *cap.* and *lib.* 2. *cap.* 9. *M. Perkins* in his reformed Catholique towards the end, *Caluin* in his booke against the Chaunter of Lions, *Beza* in his of the notes of the Church, the

the Confession of Saxony in the Chapter of the Church, and many others do reckon diuers articles, for euery one whereof they pronounce Papists to be out of the Church. And because their opinion herein is well inough knowne, and hereafter also we shall haue occasiō to shew how haynously they condemne the Popedome or Papistry, I will heere rehearse no more of their sayings touching this point. The like sentence they sometymes pronounce of the Anabaptists and Arians. For thus speaketh the confession of Ausburg Cap. 9. *They condemne the Anabaptists, who disallow the baptisme of infants, and think them to be saued without baptisme.* And the Confession of Switzerland *cap.* 20. *We condemne the Anabaptists, who deny that infants ought to be baptized.* The same is manifest by the English Confession c. 38. & by the Confession of Basle c. 24. & others. Of Arians they giue this verdict in the forsayd Confession of Ausburg in the first article: *They condemne all heresies risen against this article* (of the Trinity) *as the Manichees, Arians, Eunomians &c.* And in like sort the French Confession art. 6. the English art. 1. the consent of Poland, and others; in so much as in England the Protestants haue burnt some Arians.

Anabaptists.

Arians.

3. Sometymes also they thrust out all heretickes. For thus writeth *Luther* in his explication of the Creed. *Neither Gentile, Iew, Heretike, or any sinner is saued, vnlesse he make attonement with the Church, and in all things, thinke, do, and teach the same.* And the Magdeburgians in the preface of their 6. Century: *Neither Heretikes, nor deuisers or patrons of fanaticall opinions, are of Christ, but they are of Antichrist, and of the diuell, and appertaine to Antichrist and the diuell: they are the impostume and the plague of the people of God.* The ministers of the Prince

Heretiks Lutherās.

Elector of Saxony in the Conference held at Aldburg, in the 3. writ, cast out of the Church all, *Who* (say they) *wittingly and willingly defend such corruptions of doctrine, as haue byn condemned by the lawfull iudgment and consent of the Catholike Church.* And the Ministers of the Duke of Saxony in the 4. writ of the sayd Conference, pronounce this sentence: *Whosoeuer they are, that do cloak and defend corruptions of the word of God, that is, of the articles of sayth, after they haue byn admonished; we iudge not to be true members of Christ, vnlesse they repent.* And Vrbanus Regius, one of the first and cheifest scholers of *Luther*, in his Catechisme sayth: *All Heretikes are out of the Church.* The same teacheth Schusselburg, a principall superintendent amongst the *Lutherans* in his Catalogue of heresies, and many others. As for the Sacramentaries, thus professeth the French Confession in the 6. article: *We detest all Sects and heresies which haue byn reiected by the holy Fathers as S. Hilary, S. Athanase, S. Ambrose, S. Cyrill.* Whereupon Sadeel in his preface of his answere to the abiured articles, sayth: *Our Confession of sayth condemneth all Heretikes.* Likewise the Confession of Basle in 24. article writeth in this sort: *We driue away all, whosoeuer dissenting from the society of the holy Church, do either bring in, or follow strange & wicked doctrines.* And Peter Martyr in his Common places, in the title of heretiks: *This in summe I will say, heretikes are not otherwise to be dealt with all, then Infidells & Iewes.* Caluin also in his 2. booke of Institutions cap. 15. number. 1. *Rightly Augustin deuyeth Heretikes to haue the same foundation with the godly, albeit they preach the name of Christ.* And in his instruction against the Libertines: *That we may speake properly, Heretikes are not onely like to wolues or theeues, but much worse.* Beza in his book of punishing Heretiks: *If one terme Heretikes faithlesse apostats,*

Sacramétaries.

apoſtatas, he ſhall giue them their due title. And againe: *Heretikes affirme Chriſt in word, and deny him indeed.* Danæus in his 5. Controuerſy and 691. pag. *An heretike, condemned by lawfull iudgement, and actually caſt out of the Church, is not of the viſible Church, nor of the inuiſible neither, actually or apparently, ſo long as he remaineth in that ſtate.* Polanus in his 7. booke which he termeth Syntagma, cap. 5. *Heretikes, whiles they remayne ſuch are not members of the Catholique Church.* And Vorſtius in his Anti-bellarmin pag. 79. *The Ghoſpellers do eſteem Antichriſt in common to be euery heretike who oppoſeth himſelfe either openly and plainly, or cloſely and indirectly to Chriſt and his doctrine.* And in the 121. pag. *There is no controuerſy betweene vs and our aduerſaries touching heretikes, Schiſmatikes and Apoſtatas properly and truly ſo called, that they are altogether out of the Church of Chriſt.* Thus forraine Proteſtants. In England, his Maieſty in his epiſtle to Cardinal Peron written by Caſaubon: *The King damneth and deteſteth thoſe, who either haue departed from the ſayth of the Catholike Church, and are become heretikes, or from the Communion, and are become Schiſmatikes.* The Apology of the Church of England part. 3. diuiſ. 3. *We condemne all ſortes of the old heretike, as the Arians, the Eutichians &c. and ſhortly, all them that haue a wicked opinion either of God the Father, or of Chriſt, or of the holy Ghoſt, or of any other point of Chriſtian Religion: for ſo much as they be confuted by the Ghoſpell of Chriſt we plainly pronounce them for damnable and deteſtable perſons, and defy them euen to the diuell.* D. Whiteker in the preface of his Controuerſies: *If we be heretikes, it is reaſon they ſhould warne all theirs to fly from vs.* And Controuer. 2. queſtion. 1. cap. 4. *That he proueth heretikes and Apoſtatas and Schiſmatikes not to be members of the true Church maketh nothing againſt vs. None of our men euer taught that.* The like he hath queſtion 5. cap. 1. and

English Proteſtants.

and 18. D. Sutliue in his first booke of the Church cap. 1. *Heretikes are not of the Church*. D. Morton in his Apology 1. part. 1. booke cap. 3 affirmeth, that *Heretikes are not to be accounted of the Church in truth but in name, not indeed but equiuocally*. Finally D. White in his way to the Church pag 110. *All heretickes teach the truth in some things, and yet we deny them to be the Church of God*. And in the defence of the same way cap. 8. sect. 1. *There is little or no difference betweene the Diuell and an Apostata, or Heretike*.

They exclude Schismatiks.

4. The same censure they sometymes giue of Schismatikes, as appeareth by the words of his Maiesty, D. Whitaker, and Vorstius already rehearsed. Besides, Luther in his great Catechisme tom. 5. pag. 628. affirmeth the sense of that article, *The Communion of Saints*, to be this: *I believe that there is on earth a litle Congregation of Saints, agreeing in all things without sects or Schismes*. And Melanchthon in his booke against Swenfeild tom. 2. pag. 201. *Neither is there more then one Church, the Spouse of Christ, neither doth this company consist of diuers Sectes*. Salomon Gesnerus in his Common places the 24. place of the Church: *Catholiks are opposite to Schismatikes & heretiks*. The same teacheth Schusselburg in his 8. tome of the Catalogue of heretikes, pag. 726. 727. Amongst the Sacramentaries, the Switzers in their Confession, article 17. do thus professe: *We so much esteeme the Communion with the true Church of Christ, as that we teach, that those cannot liue before God, who communicate not with his true Church*. And the French Protestants in theirs, article 26. *We believe, that none can lawfully withdraw themselues from the assemblies*. Bullinger in his Epitome or Compendium of fayth 6. booke, 11. cap: *They be out of the Church, who vpon enuy or contention separate themselues from her, & without cause*

Lutherās.

Sacramētaries.

cause will haue some thing peculiar to themselues. Musculus also in his common places, in the title of the church: *The vnity of Heretiks and Schismatikes is bastard and diuided. True, entier, and Catholike vnity is not among Schismatikes.* And in the title of Schismatikes: *A Schismatike putteth himselfe in daunger of losse of his saluation, in departing from the Communion of the flock of the Lord. For by that departure, he is not only separated and diuided from that Ecclesiasticall and externall society of the faythfull, but also from participation of the bloud and spirit of Christ.* Caluin likewise in his treatise of the necessity of reforming the Church: *We do professe the vnity of the Church, such as is described by S. Paul, to be most deare vnto vs; and we accurse all them, that shall any way violate it.* And in his fourth booke of Institutions chap. 1. numb. 2: *Vnlesse vnder Christ our head, we be vnited to all the rest of his members, there is no hope for vs of the euerlasting inheritance. For we cannot haue two or three* (Churches) *vnlesse Christ be torne in pieces.* And num. 4. *Out of the lap the Church there is no saluation: departure from thence is alwayes pernicious.* Againe num. 10: *God maketh so great account of the Communion with his Church as he holdeth him for a renagate and fugitiue, whosoeuer obstinatly separateth himselfe from any Christian society, which retaineth the true vse of the word and Sacraments.* And he addeth, that the forsaking of the Church, *Is the deniall of God and Christ.* The like doctrine he deliuereth in his Catechisme, vpon the 1. Cor. cap. 1. and other where Polanus in his Theses part. 2. sayth: *Schismaticall Churches are to be forsaken.* And Bucanus in his places, loc. 41. of the Church, quest. 33. auoucheth Schismatiks to be out of the Church, and quest. 5. that *they are not vniuocally a Church*, that is, they haue not the true nature of a Church. The same sayth Danæus in his treatise of Antichrist cap. 17. And in his 3. booke of the Church cap. 5. writeth

thus: *Schiſmatikes actually excommunicated and caſt out of the Church by lawfull ſentence, are no more of the viſible Church. For* (ſayth he) *the marke that you be of the viſible Church, is this, that you outwardly profeſſe the ſayth, and communicate in Sacraments with the reſt of the Church.* And he addeth, that ſuch are neither *actually of the inuiſible Church, but only in poſsibility, and that the holy Fathers liken ſuch to Heathens, Pagans, and Infidells.* And in his Apology for the Switzers Churches he defineth Schiſme to be *a ſeparation from the reſt of the body of the Catholike Church.* Zanchius alſo in his treatiſe of the Church cap. 7. teacheth, that Schiſmatikes are not in the Church. And Iunius in his 3. booke of the Church c. 5. approueth the ſame of ſuch Schiſmatikes, as ſeparate themſelues from the whole Church. The ſtrangers in England writing to Beza in the 24 epiſtle haue theſe words in their 13. article: *Whoſoeuer is lawfully excommunicated of a particuler Church, or caſteth himſelfe of vpon vnlawfull cauſes, and with ſcandall, in that doth looſe all priuiledge of the Catholike Church.* And Beza anſwereth them in the name of the Church of Geneua in this manner: *Your thirteenth article we wholy receiue as moſt orthodoxall.* Caſaubon in his 15. exercitation againſt Baronius num. 6. *It is an vndoubted truth, that how often ſoeuer a pious flock is ioyned to a true Biſhop; there is a Church of God; in ſo much that if any forſake that Church, it cannot be doubted, but that he is out of the Church.* Finally, Chamier in his epiſtle to Armand, excludeth Schiſmatikes out of the Church, becauſe (ſayth he) *they want the ſincerity of the Sacraments.* Amongſt our English Proteſtants, his Maieſty in his foreſayd epiſtle to Cardinall Peron. *All thoſe teſtimonies of Auguſtin, proue only this, that there is no hope of ſalnation for thoſe, who leaue the Communion of the Catholike Church; which the King willingly graunteth.* D. Whi-

English Proteſtats

taker

taker in his 2. controuer. 3. queſt. 6. cap. ſayth: *It is falſe, that heretical and Schiſmatical Churches be true Churches.* Againe: *The Catholike Church conſiſteth not of diuided, but of vnited members.* And cap. 2: *The true and Catholike Church is that, which conſiſteth of Catholiks.* D. Fulke in his booke of the ſucceſſion of the Church: *VVhat auailed it them to eternall ſaluation, to haue byn ſound in Religion and doctrine, ſeing they were cut of from the Communion of the true Church, in which alone ſaluation is, and from her true head? VVhat skilleth it whether one, being drawne by hereſy or Schiſme, from the body of Chriſt, be ſubiect to euerlaſting damnation?* D. Humfrey in his anſwere to the 3. reaſon of F. Campian: *VVe confeſſe, that he is vndone, who is ſeparated from the fellowship of the Church.* And D. Feild in his firſt booke of the Church, cap. 7: *The name of the Catholike Church is applyed to diſtinguish men holding the fayth in vnity, from Schiſmatiks.* And in his 2. booke c. 2. he ſayth, that Schiſmatikes are not Catholike Chriſtians. Thus we ſee how Proteſtants ſometymes do teach, that the true Church conſiſteth of Catholiks, & of members vnited not deuided, that it hath no Schiſmes or Sects: That Schiſmatiks are not Catholiks, that their vnity is not true, nor Catholike, that their Churches ought to be forſaken, that they are not vniuocally Churches, nor true Churches, that they are not members of the true Church, but out of the Church, altogeather out of the Church, and actually neither of the viſible nor inuiſible Church, and that this is an vndoubted truth: which cõfeſſion of theirs muſt be well noted and kept in mind, for thereby is ouerthrowne (as we ſhall ſee in the 2. booke) their only argument wherwith they endeauour to proue, that their Church was before Luther, and alſo is defaced their only eſſentiall mark of finding the true

Church, by the truth of doctrine. For Schismatikes (as we shall heare them confesse in the 2. booke) hold true doctrine, and neuerthelesse (as here they acknowledge) are not of the true Church.

They exclude those that deny any fundamẽtal article.

5. In like manner they do commonly debarre from their Church, all such as deny any principall or fundamentall point of fayth; Melancthon in his booke of common places in the title of the Church: *They are not members of the Church who pertinaciously maintaine errours opposite to the foundation.* And in his answere to the Bauarian articles: *Saints may haue errours, but not such as ouerthrow the foundation.* In his examen of those that are to take orders: *Agreement in the foundation, is a thing necessary to the vnity of the Church.* And vpon the 3. cap. of the 1. epistle to Timothy: *The foundation is held in the Church, otherwise there should be no Church at all.* And in his 79. proposition, tom. 4: *It is most certaine, that those companies are not the Church of God, who either are altogether ignorant of the Ghospell, or impugne some article of the foundation, that is, some article of fayth or doctrine of the decalogue, or maintaine open idols.* Chemnitius in his common places pa. 3. title of the Church: *Neither can these be acknowledged for the true Church, who imbrace fundamentall errours.* And the Lutherans in the conference at Ratisbon, Sess. 14. Hutter in his Analysis of the Confession of Ausburg, Gesner in his 24. place, Adam Francis in his 11. place, and other Lutherans commonly agree, that the Church *cannot erre Fundamentally, or in the Foundation.* And the Confession of Saxony giueth this note, to know who are in the Church: *Those who hold the Foundation.* As for Sacramentaries, Caluin in his 4. booke of Institutions cap. 2. num. 1: *So soone as alye hath broken into the castle of Religion, the summe of necessary doctrine is ouerted, the vse of*

Lutherãs.

Sacramẽtaries.

Sacra-

Sacraments is fallen, certainly the deſtruction of the Church enſueth, euen as a mans life is loſt, when his throat is cut, or his vitall parts deadly wounded. And ſoone after: *It is certaine, that there is no Church, where lyes and errour haue gotten to the toppe.* And cap. 19. num. 17: *Without doubt the Church of the faythfull muſt agree in all the heads of our Religion.* Sadeel in his anſwere to the Theſes held at Poſna cap. 12: *I thinke the matter is thus to be defined by the word of God, that if any in what Church ſoeuer diſſent in the foundation of fayth, and be obſtinate in their errours: ſuch appertaine not to the vnity of the Church.* The like he hath in his anſwere to Arthure, cap. 12. Veſinus in his Catechiſme queſt. 54. cap. 4: *The whole Church erreth not, nor wholly, nor in the foundation.* Polanus in his Theſis of the Church layth: *The Church erreth not in the foundation.* The ſame teacheth Zanchius in his treatiſe of the Church c. 7. Lubbertus in his 2. booke of the Church c. 3. Vorſtius in his Anti-bellarmin pag. 139. Bucanus in his 41. place, and other Sacramentaries commonly. And with them herein agree our Engliſh Proteſtants. For thus ſayth his Maieſty in his epiſtle to Cardinall Peron: *The Churches are vnited in vnity of fayth and doctrine, in thoſe heads which are neceſſary to ſaluation.* And D. Whitaker in the preface of his Controuerſies: *The foundations of fayth are of that nature, that one being ſhaken, nothing in all religion remaineth ſound.* And Contr. 2. queſt. 4. cap. 1: We ſay, that the Church cannot erre in things ſimply neceſſary. Which he often repeateth in the 2. cap. And queſt. 5. cap. 17: *If any fundamentall doctrine be taken away, the Church ſtraight way falleth.* And cap. 18: *The fundamentall articles are thoſe, on which our fayth relyeth, as the houſe vpon the foundation.* Againe: *If any fundamentall and eſſentiall principle of fayth be ouerturned or ſhaken, it cannot be truly called a Church.*

Engliſh Proteſtãts

And

And queſt. 6. cap. 3: *That is no true Church which taketh away one only ſoundation.* The ſame he teacheth in his 1. booke of the ſcripture cap. 7. ſect. 8. and cap. 12. ſect. 3. M. Perkins in his explication of the Creed: *If any man or Church, retaine, or defend, obſtinately, or of willfull ignorance, a fundamentall errour, we muſt not account them any more Chriſtians or Churches.* D. Sutliue in his firſt booke of the Church cap. 1: *Theſe blemiſhes take away the name of the true Church, which are againſt the grounds of fayth.* D. Feild in his 2. booke of the Church cap. 3: *Purity free from fundamentall and eſſentiall errour, is neceſſarily required in the Church.* D. Morton in the 1. part of his Apology, booke 2. cap 38: *Purity of doctrine in fundamentall principles of fayth, is required to the being and conſtitution of the Church.* And in his anſwere to the Proteſtants Apology l. 4. c. 3. Sect. 5: *The deniall of fundamentall doctrines, doth exclude men from ſaluation, and diſannulleth the name of the Church in the gainſayers.* D. White in his way to the Church pag. 110: *We do not thinke euery company to be the true Church, that holdeth only ſome points of the true fayth: but it is requiſite that the foundation be holden.* And in his defence of the way cap. 17: *A fundamentall point is that which belongs to the ſubſtance of fayth, and is ſo neceſſary that there can be no ſaluation without the knowledge and explicite fayth thereof.* And ſurely they all, and at all tymes, ought to affirme this, ſeeing they deliuer truth of doctrine, as an eſſentiall marke of the Church, which they muſt needs vnderſtand (and ſo Vorſtius in his Anti-bellarmin pag. 148. expreſſeth it) of true doctrine in fundamentall points. And this their doctrine touching this matter, I earneſtly commend to the memory of the Reader, becauſe it is neceſſary to find out, what a Proteſtant is, and alſo is one of the grounds, whereby it may appeare, that

that there was no Protestant Church before *Luther*, because before him there was no company which held all the same fundamentall points of doctrine which Protestants do hold.

6. Finally; they sometyms shut out of their Church all those, who deny any one point of fayth, be it fundamentall or other. For thus writeth the Apology of the Confession of Auspurge: *The Church of Christ is not among them, who defend naughty opinions, contrary to the Ghospell.* And *Luther* in his epistle to Count Albert: *It is not inough, if in other things he confesse Christ and his Ghospell. For who denieth Christ in one article or word, denieth him, who is denied in all, because there is but one Christ, the same in all his words.* And vpon the 17. cap. of Deuteronomy: *Faith suffereth nothing, and the word tolerateth nothing, but the word must be perfectly pure, and the doctrine alwayes sound throughout.* And vpon the 17. cap. of S. Matthew: *Fayth must be round, that is, believing all articles, though small ones. For who believeth not one article rightly, believeth nothing rigthly, as Iames sayth, Who offendeth in one, is guilty of all: and so who in one article doubteth or believeth not (at least obstinatly) dissolveth the roundnes of the graine, and so can do no good.* And vpon the 5. cap. to the Galathians: *In divinity a small errour overthroweth all the doctrine. Doctrine is like to a Mathematicall point, it cannot be deuided, that is, it cannot suffer either addition or detraction.* And when Zuinglius and his followers desired of the Lutherans to be esteemed as their brethren, Melanchthon (as Hospinian reporteth in his Sacramentarian history fol. 81.) roughly sayd vnto them: *We mervaile with what conscience they can account vs for brethren, whome they iudge to erre in doctrine.* And againe fol. 82. *Luther gravely spake vnto them, saying: he greatly mervailed how they could hold him for a brother, if they thought his doctrine to be yours.* And the same

They exclude all that deny any article of fayth.

Lutherās.

same Melanchon together with Brentius writeth thus to the Lantgraue: *Perhaps Christians, who are entangled in some errour, which they do not obstinately defend, may be tolerated as brethren, but they which not only bring false doctrine into the Church, but also maintaine it, are not to be acknowledged for brethren.* And againe Melanchon in his examen of those who are to take orders, tom. 3. *There are in that company (of the Church) many who are not Saints, but yet agreeing in doctrine.* The Deuines of Wittemberg in their refutation of the orthodoxall consent pag. 73: *Like as he who keepeth the whole Law and offendeth in one (as Iames the Apostle witnesseth) is guilty of all: so who believeth not one word of Christ, albeit he seeme to belive the other articles of the Creed, yet believeth nothing, and is to be dawned as incredulous. For every heretike did not impugne every article of fayth, but commonly each of them of purpose impugned some one or other, whome neuerthelas the Church iustly condemned as heretikes, if they pertinaciously stood in their errours.* Schusselburg also in his 3. tom. of the Catalogue of Heretiks, pag. 85. *Christian fayth is one copulatiue, and who denieth one article of fayth, calleth in doubt the whole body of the heauenly doctrine.* Which he repeateth againe in the next pag. And tome 8. pag. 361: *The Lutherans do fly him, who depraueth the doctrine of truth in any article whatsoeuer.* And in his 2. booke of Caluinisticall diuinity, article 1: *We are certaine by the testimony of Gods word, that an errour in one false doctrine, obstinatly defended, maketh an heretike. For S. Chrysostome vpon the epistle to the Galathians sayd most truly, that he corrupteth the whole doctrine who ouerthroweth it in the least article. And Ambrose wrote rightly to the Virgin Demetrias, That he is out of the number of the faythfull, and hath no part in the inheritance of Saints, who disagreeth in any thing from the Catholike truth.* Thus the Lutherans. Peter Martyr in his epistle to the straungers in England

Sacramentaries.

tom.

tom. 2. loc. col. 136: *VVe answere, all the words of God, as farre forth as they proceeded from him, are of equall waight and authority, and therefore none may receive this, and reiect that as false. Iames sayth boldly, who sinneth in one, becommeth guilty of all. That, if it have place in keeping of the commandements, it also true in points of fayth.* Sadeel in his index of Turrians Repetitions pag. 806: *I sayd, that it was no true Church, which teacheth doctrine repugnant to the written word of God.* And his Maiesty in his Monitory epistle pag. 97. in Latin: *I call God to witnes, that I hold him not for a Christian who in this learned age believeth that.* (to wit, that Enoch and Elias are to come.) And D. Morton in his answere to the Protestants Apology lib. 4. c. 2. sect. 3. after he had sayd, that in a Church, albeit corrupted with errour and superstition, yet if it do not ruinate the foundation, the erroneous & superstitious professors may be saued, addeth: *VVhich notwithstanding we must so vnderstand, as that the errour and superstition do not proceed from knowledge but from ignorance, which ignorance is not affected but simple.* Thus we see that Protestants somtymes confesse that true fayth is like a graine, or Mathematicall point, which cannot be parted; that the articles of fayth are one copulatiue, and cannot be deuided, that who so obstinatly denieth one article, believeth, truly, none; that the obstinate deniall of any one poynt of fayth is sufficient to damne, or to make an heretik, and no brother of the faythfull, or member of the Church. And finally, that she is no true Church, who willfully maintaineth any one thing repugnant to the Ghospell or word of God. Which indeed is most true, and is the doctrine of the holy Fathers and Catholiks, and I would to God Protestants would constantly stand vnto it. English Protestats

71 By all, which hath byn rehearsed in this chapter

chapter out of Protestants, it appeareth how many sortes of Christians, Protestants do sometymes exclude out of the Church, namely Papists, Anabaptists, Arians, al Heretiks, all Schismatiks, all those, who deny any fundamentall point of fayth, and finally al who obstinatly deny any point whatsoeuer of fayth, or of the word of God. And how many things they sometymes require to the making and being of a Protestant, to wit, that he believe all and euery point of their fayth, and obstinatly dissent in none. To which their doctrine, if they would (as I haue sayd) alwayes constantly stand, it would easily appeare, first how small a company the Protestants Church is, and how little it is spread through the world, and much lesse Catholike or vniuersal, seeing there is no Prouince, nor scarse any citty, in which all Protestants agree amongst themselues in al points of their doctrine. Secondly it would easily appeare that the Protestant Church was neuer before *Luther*, seeing there is no apparence, that before him there was any company of Christians who in all points of doctrine agreed with Protestants. But Protestats (as I sayd in the Preface) accommodate their doctrine and opinions to tymes and occasions. And the tymes, when they deny Papists to be of the Church, are when they exhort them to leaue the Roman Church, or excuse their owne reuolting from her, or when they dehort others from returning to her. For at all these tymes, it serueth to their purpose to deny that Papists are of the Church, or in the way of saluation; which at other tymes, as we shall see in the next chapter, they are content to graunt. And the tymes when they exclude Anabaptists, Arians, Heretiks, Schismatiks, and all that deny either fundamentall

damentall or other articles of fayth, out of the Church, are, when either the euidence of truth enforceth them thereto, or when they are ashamed to acknowledge such vgly monsters for brethren and members of their Church, or would exhort such as haue left their company to returne vnto them, and keep others from forsaking them: or finally would brag of the agreement and purity in doctrine of their company. For at those tymes it serueth their turne to renounce all the foresayd kind of men, whom at other tymes, especially when we demaund of them, who were of their Church before Luther, they are most willing to receiue, as their kind brethren; diligently scraping & gathering such shreeds and clouts, when they perceiue their owne nakednes and beggary, which themselues, when they thought they were rich and had no need thereof, most disdainfully cast on the dunghills, as shall appeare in the chapters following.

CHAP. II.

That Protestants sometymes account Papists for members of their Church.

IN the former chapter we haue seene how sparing Protestants sometyms be in admitting others into their Church, now we shall see how liberall they be at other tymes, in so much that they graunt, not only all those, whome in the former chapter they reiected, but also their professed enemies, Idolaters, Infidells, Atheists, Antichrist himselfe, and all, whosoeuer vnder the name of Christians, impugne the deede or

doctrine of the Pope, to be their brethren, their followers, and members of their Church. This we will shew concerning the Papists in this chapter, and of the others afterward.

Lutherus. 1. That Protestants sometymes do acknowledge Papists to be in the Church is manifest. First by their open confession thereof. For in the preface of their Confession of Ausburg, speaking of themselues and Papists, they say: *We are all soldiers vnder one* Papists serue vnder christ. *Christ.* And Luther in his epistle against the Anabaptists (as Caluin in his booke against the Chaunter of Lions, and D. Whitaker in the place hereafter cited do confesse) writeth: *That in Popery is true Christianity, yea the kernell of Christianity, and many pious and great Saints.* The kernel of Christianity in Popery. Againe: *If Christianity be vnder the Pope, then it must be the body and member of Christ.* And vpon the 28. chapter of Genesis: *We confesse, that there is a Church among the Papists, because they haue Baptisme, absolution, the text of the Gospell, and many godly men are among them.* Caluin in his 140. epistle to Sozin: *I think I haue sufficiently proued, that in Popery there remaineth some Church, albeit halfe destroyed, and if you will, broken and deformed.* And vpon the 2. The Body of Christ. chap. of the 2. epistle to the Thessalonians: *I confesse it is the temple of God, in which the Pope ruleth; and he calleth it the very sanctuary of God.* And, de vera reform. pag. Sacramentaries. 332. sayth, *that S. Paul affirmeth that Antichrist (whom he will haue to be the Pope) shall sit in the temple of God.* And lib. de scandalis pag. 103: *In the midest of Gods temple.* And lib. cont. Precentorem pag. 372: *In the very sanctuary of God.* And Respons. ad Sadolet: *In the midst of Gods sanctuary.* Surely this is to graunt, that the Romane Church, in which the Pope sitteth, is the very temple and very sanctuary of God. And in his answeare to Sadolet: *We deny not those to be Churches of*

Christ, which yet plainer. In his 4. booke of Institutions, chap. 2. num. 11. he layth, that among Papists Gods covenant remayned inviolable. And num. 12. *We deny not, that there are Churches among them. Neither deny we, but there remaine Churches vnder him* (the Pope he meaneth) *tyranny; but which he hath almost killed.* Iunius in his booke of the Church, cap. 17. writeth that the Popish Church, *in farre as it hath that which belongeth to the definition of a Church, is a Church; that it hath not given vp the ghost, that it hath all diuine things, and of Gods part is yet the Church.* Zanchius in the preface of his booke of the nature of God: *Satan euen in the very Roman Church could not bring all things to that passe, that it should no more haue the forme of a Christian Church.* And soone after: *Wherefore the Roman Church is yet the Church of Christ.* Plessy in his booke of the Church 2. chap. auoucheth, that the Roman Church is the Spouse of Christ, is not yet forsaken of him, that as a Mother, she beareth children to God (which he repeateth againe in the 10. chap.) that she retaineth life, and that the name of the Church ought no more to be denied to her, then the name of a man vnto a liuing man. Bucan in his 41. place of the Church, quest. 5: *The assemblies of Papists are Churches, as a man infected with leprosy yet besides his matter, doth not leaue to be a man.* Polanus in his first part and Thesis of the Church: *The Roman Church truly is a Church; because Antichrist sitteth in the Church.* And in his Syntagme of diuinity lib. 7. c. 8: *The present Roman Church is yet the Church of Christ.* Sersuis in his defence of the degrees of ministers, pag. 36: *The Roman Church, is a Church, and mark what I say more, she is our mother, in whome and by whom, God did regenerate vs.* And pag. 35. *The couenant of God remayneth this day in the Latin Church.* Boyssel in his confutation of Spondé pag. 61: I ex-

Not yet killed.

Not yet dead.

Yet the Church of Christ.

Spouse of Christ.

abide not the Roman Church out of the vniuersall Church: I acknowledge her to be yet in the couenant of God; which he repeateth oftentymes. And pag. 12: The Roman Church, is the Church of God. Pag. 19: It is a member of the vniuersall Church. p. 283: It is yet the Church, Spouse and temple of God. And pag. 822: We deny not, that the Roman Church is the Church of Iesus Christ, redeemed by him. Vorstius in his Anti-bellarmin p. 188: The vulgar Roman church hath not yet lost all spirituall life, is not yet openly denounced from Christ. And Peter Martyr in his epistle to Bullinger, writeth, that he gaue counsaile, that the Papists & they should not call one the other Heretiks, but account themselues for brethren. As for English Protestants, his Maiesty in his speach to the Parlement, anno 1605. 9. of November, and put forth in print, speaketh thus: We do iustly confesse, that many Papists, especially our late fathers, laying their only trust vpon Christ and his merits, may be, and oftentymes are saued; detesting in that point, and thinking the cruelty of Puritans worthy of fire, that will admit no saluation to any Papist. And in his epistle to Cardinall Perron: The Roman, the Greek & Churches, are members of the Catholike Church. And D. Andrews in his Tortura Torti towards the end, speaketh thus to the Papists: We are content to call you members of the Catholike Church, though not sound members. Hooker in his 3. book of Ecclesiasticall policy pag. 128: We gladly acknowledge them to be of the family of Iesus Christ. And lib. 5 pag. 188: They should acknowledge so much neuertheles still due to the same Church (of Rome) as to be held and reputed a part of the house of God, a limme of the visible Church of Christ. D. Couel in his defence of Hooker pag. 68. sayth: We affirme them of the Church of Rome, to be parts of the Church of Christ, and that those that liue and dye in that Church, may notwithstanding be saued. D. Barlow in his 3. sermon ad Clerum:

Yet the Church Spouse & temple of God.

Yet aliue.

English Protestants

Papists may be saued.

Members of the Catholike Church.

Of the family of Christ.

May be saued. Note.

Clerum: *The learnedier writers do acknowledge the Church of Rome, to be the Church of God.* M. Bunny in his treatise of Pacification, sect. 18: *Neither of vs* (Papists & Protestants) *may iustly account the other to be none of the Church of God. We are no seperall Church from them, nor they from vs.* D. Sonda against Penry in diuers places auoucheth, *That Papists are not aliened nor alien from Gods couenant. That in the iudgement of all learned men, and all reformed Churches, there is in Popery a Church, a Ministery, a true Christ: If you think that all the Popish sect which died in the Popish Church, are damned, you think absurdly, and dissent from the iudgement of the learned Protestants.* D. Whitaker in his fourth controuersy quest. 5. cap. 3. calleth the Popish Church, *the temple of God, more then halfe dead, and almost decayed.* And that people, wherein the Apostle saith, that Antichrist shall sit, and which he affirmeth to be the Roman Church, he termeth *the very Church of God, the true Church of God, the society of the faithfull, the liuely temple composed of liuely stones, such as are the faithfull of the elect.* And he addeth: *There is among them* (Papists) *some Ministery and some preaching of the word, which doubtlesse affordeth saluation vnto some. And as the gifts of God are without repentance; so the couenant which God made with Christian people, is not quite broken.* And tom. 2. quest. 5. cap. 5. after he had confessed, that Luther had sayd, that in Popery are all the goods belonging to Christians, the keyes, the office of preaching, true Christianity, and the very kernell of Christianity, he addeth: *These things are indeed among them.* M. Powell in his 2. booke of Antichrist, cap. 1. graunteth the Roman Church to be the true Church, albeit with a new kind of distinction he deny the Popish church. And D. Reinolds in his 5. Thesis, albeit he say that the Roman Church be more then sickly and weake,

Gods couenant with Papists.

yet he dares not say that the is quite dead. And D. White in his way, p. 352. sayth, *That Popery in as much as it differeth from vs, is not to be imagined by vs to be another Church distinct in place and countries from the true Church of Christ: but we affirme it to be a contagion, raging in the midst of the Church of Christ it selfe.* And in his defence c. 372 pag. 355: *I never denied the Church of Rome to be the visible Church of God, wherein our auncestors professed the truth, and were saued.* And cap. 41. pag. 408: *Professing the Church of Rome it selfe in all ages, to haue byn the visible Church of God.* Lastly D. Hall in his Rome Irreconciliable c. 1. sayth, that the Romen Church *is a true visible Church, but not sound*, and that it differeth from the Protestant Church, *As the sick from the whole.* Hereto I adde, that oftentymes they call the Roman Church their Mother, which hath borne them to Christ, as we shall heare hereafter, & that before Luthers tyme they seeke their Church in Popery, and amongst the Papists.

That Papists hold the foundation of fayth.

8. Secondly I proone this same out of that which diuers tymes they graunt, that the Roman Church holdeth all the fundamentall articles of fayth, which themselues commonly teach (as hereafter shall be shewed) to suffice to make a Church. Their Confession of Ausburg in the 21. chapter hath these wordes: *There is almost no controuersy among vs, in which as in any seruice, there is nothing which differeth from Scripture, or from the Catholike Church, or from the Roman Church (so farre as it appeareth by writers.) All the dissension is about some few abuses, which haue crept into Churches without certaine authority.* Whereby we see that the first and auncientest Protestants, publikly professed, that they differed not from the Roman Church in the summe of doctrine, but that all their

Lutherans.

The same of fayth in Popery.

their disagreement was about some few abuses. And albeit the wordes be somewhat altered in the printed copies; yet that they were in the originall copie which was presented to Charles 5. Emperour, is manifest by Fabritius, who repeateth them so out of that copie; by Pappus, in his 3. defence against Sturmius, who so also reporteth them; by Zanchius in his dispute between two Diuines, where he repeateth these wordes out of the said Confession: *There is nothing in our doctrine which differeth from the church of Rome, as far as it is known by writers*: and finally by Hieremias Patriarch of Constantinople in his censure vpon the said Confession, it being sent vnto him by the Protestants, where he thus writeth to them: *Yee say, yee agree in all things with the Latins, and that the difference betwixt you and them, is only touching some abuses*: likwise Luther in his foresaid epist. cont. Anabap: *We confesse that in Popery is much good belonging to Christians, yea all Christian good, to wit, that in Popery is the true Scripture, true baptisme, the true Sacrament of the altar, the true keyes for remission of sinnes, the true office of preaching, the true Catechisme, as the Lords prayer, the ten commaundements, and the articles of faith.* Whereupon Schusselburg in his 8. tome of the Catalogue of heretikes pag. 439. saith: *We denyne but that Luther sayd that all Christian goods are in Popery, and came from thence vnto vs.* Iohn Regius in his consideration of the censure &c: *Albeit the Ministery of Papists be corrupted with many traditions and inuentions of men, yet it had that which was necessary to saluation, to wit the Canonicall scripture, the Creedes.* Leonard Crentzen: *The bishop of Rome holdeth the same foundation of the Catholike faith 1. Cor. 3. which I and the Catholik apostolik Church do acknowledge, although there be some difference of opinions in certaine circumstances.*

Cocleus anno 1528 Vlēberg. cauſa 17.

All Christiā goods.

What was needfull to saluation.

The foundation of Faith.

Sacramentaries.

Thus the Lutherans. Of the Sacramentaries, Iunius in his 5. controuerſy lib. 3. cap. 19. writeth thus of Papiſts, Lutherans, and Caluiniſts: *VVe agree in the eſſentiall foundation.* Zanchius in his foreſayd preface:

Eſſentiall foundation.

In deſpite of the Diuel that Church (of Rome) hath kept the principall grounds of fayth. Boyſſeul alſo in his forenamed confutation pag. 79: *VVe acknowledge that it is pure in the cheife articles of Chriſtian Religion.* And Vorſtius in his

Principall grounds of fayth.

Anti-bellarmin pag. 188. *It is manifeſt that there are many in that company (of Papiſts) who rightly hold the fundamentall points of our Religion.* And of the Engliſh Proteſtants, his Maieſty in his monitory epiſtle pag. 148. plainly intimateth that Papiſts *do ſtick vnto the auntient foundations of the old true Catholike and apoſtolike fayth.* M. Hooker in his 3. booke of Eccleſiaſticall policy pag. 128 ſayth: *Touching thoſe maine points of Chriſtian truth,*

The fundamentall points.

English Proteſtats

wherein they conſtantly ſtill perſiſt, we gladly acknowledge them to be of the family of Ieſus Chriſt. D. Whitaker in his 2. cont. queſt. 5. cap. 14: *Papiſts haue the Scriptures, Baptiſme, Catechiſme, the articles of fayth, the ten commandments, the*

The main points.

Lords prayer, and thoſe things came to vs from them. D. Whitgift in his anſwere vnto the admonition pag. 40: *Papiſtry confeſſeth the ſame articles of fayth that we do, although not ſincerely.* And pag. 63: *Papiſts beleeue the ſame articles of fayth that we do.* M. Perkins in the preface of his reformed Catholike: *By a reformed Catholike I vnderſtand any one that holds the ſame neceſſary heads of Religion, with the Romane Church, yet ſo as he payes of, and reiects all errours in doctrine,*

The neceſſary heads.

whereby the ſayd religion is corrupted. D. Morton in his anſwere to the Proteſtants Apology lib. 3. cap. 18. ſect. 1: *VVe may graunt, that God may vouchſafe with them to the*

The goſpell of ſaluation.

conuerſion of Infidels, ſo far as the Goſpell of Chriſt, which is the power of God to ſaluation, is preached by them. D. White in defence of his way cap. 38: *In the ſubſtantiall articles*

of

of faith, we agree with them. Lastly D. Hall in his forelayd booke sayth; that the Romane Church is one touching the common principles of faith. These things which she holdeth together with vs, make a Church. As farre as she holdeth the foundation, she is a church. The substantiall articles.

3. Thirdly, the same point is proued, by that they graunt some to be saints, whom they acknowledge also to haue liued and died Papists. For of S. Bernards holines thus writeth Luther vpon the 4. cap. to the Galathians: *Bernard a man so holy, pious, chast, &c.* The Apology of the Confession of Ausburg in the chapter of answere to the Arguments vrging, *Bernard, Francis, Dominicke, and other holy Fathers.* Brentius in his Apology for the Confession of Wirtenberg pag. 297. *I iudge Bernard to haue byn a man indued with great piety, and to liue now happily with Christ.* Caluin in his 3. booke of institutions c. 7. num. 22. *Gregory and Bernard holy men.* Vorstius in Anti-bellarmin pag. 184: *I graunt Bernard indeed to haue byn pious.* Ironbutus in his 6. booke of the church c. 7: *We think Bernard to haue byn truly holy.* D. Whitaker cont. 3. quest. 5. c. 14. *I graunt Bernard to haue byn holy indeed.* And D. Morton in his Apology part. 2. lib. 2. c. 13: *I confesse Bernard was a Saint.* And as plainly do they confesse him to haue byn a Papist. For that Luther in the place now cited: *Let vs imagine that religion and discipline of the ancient Fathers to flourish now, and to be obserued with that rigour, with which the Ermits, Bernard, Augustin, Bernard, Francis, and many others obserued it.* And in his booke of abrogating Masse: *Bernard, Romanus, Francis, Dominicke, with their followers, not touching the Pope, did honour his Kingdome; beleeuing all things thereof to be good and iust, and of God.* The Magdeburgians in their 12. Century col. 1637. speake thus of him: *He worshipped the God of Mauzim* (they meane the masse) *till the last mo-* That they say some Papists be saints.

ment of this life. And in the next volume: He was a most eager defendant of the seat of Antichrist. Melanchthon in his booke of the Church, and vpon the 14. cap. to the Romanes: He yelded to many errours; as to the shapes of the Masse, to the Popes power, to vowes, to the worship of Saints. Danæus in his controuersies, pag. 313. sayth: He approued the Papacy. M. Iewell in his defence of the Apology 2. part. diuis. 2. pag. 456: Bernard was a monk, and liuing in a tyme of such corruption, and being caryed with the tempest and violence of the same must &c. Bale in his 12. century of writers pag. 272: He increased the authority of the bishop of Rome, as much as he could. D. Feild vpon the 14. of S. Matthew: Bernard was deceiued with the errour of Peters superiority. And D. Whitaker in his answere to the 7. reason of Father Campian: Bernard, whome alone your church in many yeares hath brought forth a holy man. And in his 4. controuersy quest. 2. c. 17. he affirmeth that he endeauoureth to confirme the Popes superiority. Seing therefore by the confession of Protestants, he was both an earnest Papist vnto his dying day, for all his life tyme he honoured masse, beleiued the Popes superiority (in which two points Protestants say the essence and soule of a Papist doth consist) and briefly beleiued all things belonging to the Pope to come from God; and also was a very holy man, in his life tyme, and now a blessed Saint in heauen; they must needs confesse, that euen the most vehement Papist may be of the church; because neither true sanctity, nor saluatiō can be found out of the church. Whereunto the Protestants in the late Conference at Ratisbon Sess. 13. say: If they were truly saints, then their errour was not of that kind which ouerturneth the foundation. For it implieth contradiction, that one should be a true Saint, and yet professe errour which ouerturneth the ground of sal-

nation. In like sort they graunt diuers others to be true Saints, and yet will hall Papists; but for breuities sake I will content my selfe with this example of S. Bernard. But I will not omit to say, that they confesse our Christian forefathers before Luthers tyme to haue byn Papists, from the top to the toe, from the first to the last, as shall be shewed in their books cap. 3. and notwithstanding dare not say, that they be damned, yea confesse them to be saued. Luther in his books of priuate masse enquireth, what is to be thought of our auncestors who haue founded innumerable Masses; and answereth: *I cannot tell certainly.* But vpon the 47. cap. of Genesis, he sayth: *Doubtlesse many haue byn saued vnder Popery.* And vpon the 5. of S. Matthew: *Neither doe I condemne the Christians who liued vnder the Pope.* Brentius in the preface of his Recognition: *We doubt not; but that many haue enioyed true saluation in Popery.* Oſiander in his Manuall englished: *We doe not condemne our Popish auncestors who liued in time of Popery.* Zuinglius in his acts of disputation fol. 438: *It is impium. to pronounce our auncestors to be damned.* D. Morton in his Apology part. 1. lib. 2. c. 90. *Be the impiety far from vs, to damne our auncestors, to damnation.* And D. White in his defence pag. 356. *I neuer denyed the Church of Rome to be the visible Church of God, wherein our auncestors professed the true faith and were saued.* But how could our Popish auncestors be not damned, how could they be saued, vnles they were in the true Church, out of which euen Protestants them selues confesse, that there is no saluation, but only damnation.

Our Popish forefathers saued.

that they confesse mission and Pastors in Popery.

Fourthly I propose that Protestants cannot deny Papists to be of the true Church, because they oftentymes both by word and deed acknowledge the vocation and Mission of Popish Pastors, to

be

be lawfull and sufficient to make a true Pastour of the Church: hither vpon the 5. cap. of S. Matthew: *We confesse that among the Papists are pulpits, Baptisme, Sacraments, and all other things belonging to Apostolical vocation and function.* And in his booke of private masse: *There remaineth in Popery Vocation, Ordination, Ministery of the word, and keyes to binde and loose.* Againe: *Christ hath preserued his Ministery vnder Popery.* And as before cited: *There is all Christian gouernment in Popery, the keyes, the charge of preaching &c.* Iohn Regius in considerat. Cellensz pag. 93. *Although it be true that the Popish ministery is depraued with sundry traditions and deuises of men, yet hath it those things which were necessary to saluation.* Bucer in Rom. 8. pag. 427. calling vs by what authority and right he preached Protestantisme, saith: *I haue by lawfull meanes already entered the charge to preach Christ, and to teach those things which be commanded.* Iunius lib. singulari de eccles. cap. 17. *God calleth the church wherein Popery raigneth, by his spirit, by his word, by the publike instrument of that holy marriage, by the ministery, by sacred assemblies & actions. Of God we at the first might appeare, that he had such Pietie* lib. de eccles. cap. 11. pag. 161. *The vocation (of our men) is the same the holy (the Papistes) beare.* Pag. 162. *Our elders seruice and our function hath the same lawfull originall calling.* Boyssetus in canon. Synod. pag. 486. *It is no reproach for our Pastours to make issue of yours, or to your selues, to haue had their vocation from you.* Moulin. lib. 1. de vocat. cap. 5. pag. 100. endeauouring to vphold the calling of their first Reformers, saith: *They had a lawfull calling which is ordinary in the church of Rome* Pa. 21: *They had their calling of the Pope.* cap. 9. pag. 56. *They had the same breuiary calling which our aduersaries haue.* And lib. 2. tract. 2. cap. 1. pag. 172. *Their calling they had in the church of Rome, sufficed to bind them to preach.* And pag. 173. *Their vnlawfulnesse no other but the*

ordinary

ordinary charge. Sententiarius dicter. Graſſer. lib. 1. cap. 2. pag. 31. *Vt vnde nouo ritus, that in the church of Rome eccleſiaſticall miniſtery is decayed.* And pag. 33. *Into new fraudes, who acknowledge no miniſtery in the church of Rome, but deeme all that is there, diuelish.* Ibid. *But a deale more against Papiſh orders ouer much, aduertiſe I feare leaſt to preiudice a good cauſe.* D. Whitaker contr. 4 Queſt. 5 cap. 3. pag. 482; *The Papiſticall ſeme ſort of miniſtery, and ſome preaching of the word, which doubtles auaileth many to ſaluation.* And other where (as is before cited) *among the Papiſts there are the keyes, the office of preaching &c.* M. Bell in his firſt booke of the Popes funerall cap. 3. affirmeth that he had reiected only the accidents of his Popiſh orders, but retayned the ſubſtance ſtill. M. Maſon in his 5. booke of the ordination of miniſters, cap. 12. ſayth, that Popiſh ordination conſiſtes of two parts, to wit, of power to offer ſacrifice, & of power to adminiſter the word and Sacraments, and albeit he reiecteth the former, yet the later he approues, as that wherein true miniſtery conſiſteth. Sacred reſpon. ad artic. abiurat. 61. And Vorſtius in Anti-bellarmin pag. 177. teach the ſame; and ſo muſt all others do, who hold the miſſion of Luther and his firſt miniſters to haue byn ordinary, and receiued from the Papiſts: which opinion moſt Proteſtants do now follow, retracting, vpon better aduiſe their former aſſertion, & confeſſing that the miſſion of their new Reformers, was not in ſubſtance extraordinary. And their deeds and actions do no leſſe declare their approbation and eſteeme of the miſſion and Paſtorall charge which is in the church of Rome, For as Turrian reporteth lib. 3. de Eccleſ. cap. 3. and Luther inſinuateth tom. 2. epiſt. ad Boberum, when the Catholike Biſhops giue orders, the Miniſters of Babylon ſtaale

seale in priuily among themselues. The Lutherans also made suite vnto the estate of the Empire, that their ministers might receiue orders from the bishops of Mispia and Numburg. And in artic. 10. Smalcald. they professe thus: *If the bishops (of the church of Rome) would truly execute their office, and looke carefully to the church and word of God, it might be permitted them to giue orders vnto vs and our preachers.* You may adde hereunto, that neither Luther nor any Reformer else euer sought other ordination, then what they had receiued of Papists; and that in the beginning of Queene Elizabeths reigne, the supposed Prelates earnestly besought a Catholike Bishop to consecrate them. And euen to this day, if any renegate Priest ioyne himselfe to the Protestants, they order him not anew, but deeme him fit for their ministeriall function, by vertue of the orders he receiued of Papists. Now if Papists haue true Mission, true pastorall charge, and true Pastors, surely they haue also the true church; it being impossible, that the church should be severed frō the true Pastours; or that the keyes of heauen which are in the true Pastours hands, should be out of the church, or that the power to remit sinnes, the prerogatiue of true Pastours, should be where the church is not. Nay, the Protestants themselues confesse as much. Luther tom. 4. in cap. 4. Osee fol. 295: *True it is, that the Ministery is only in the Church.* Melanchton tom. 1. Lutheri disput de Eccles. Polit. fol. 483: *The ordination of Ministers is one of the peculiar giftes of the Church.* Caluin lib. de necess. reform. Eccles. pag. 57: *This one reason is as good as thousands, that in so doing hath shewed himself an enemy to true doctrine, hath lost all authority in the Church.* D. Whitaker ad demonstrat. 18. Sanderi: *Out of the Church there is no other seate but the seat of errour, of pestilence,*

True mission and Pastors inseparable frō the Church.

and

and mortifying doctrine. The same teacheth Sadeel ad Sophism. Turrian loc. 10. D. Feild in his 2. booke of the church cap. 14. and others.

5. Fiftly it is evident by the doctrine of the Sacramentaries, who hold that the children of Papistrare in the covenant of God, and estate of salvation, through the fayth of their parents; and may therefore be baptised: much more then must they teach, that the parents themselves are for their owne fayth in the covenant of God and estate of salvation, which could not be, were they not in the Church. The antecedent is manifest by the saying of many Protestants. For thus writeth Luther lib. de capt. Babylon. tom. 2. fol. 77: *Here I say that which all say, that infants are holpen by the fayth of them which offer them.* Calvin in his Catechisme cap. de lege: *God extendeth his bounty so farre unto the faythfull, that for their sake he is good to their children, not only blessing their affaires in this world, but also sanctifying their soules, that they may be accounted of his flocke.* Contr. Scruetum. pag. 601: *We think, that there will be no use of Baptisme until this promise, I will be thy God and of thy seed, be apprehended by fayth; but every one apprehendeth it not only to himselfe, but also to his issue.* Beza part. 2. Respon. ad acta Montisbel. pag. 118: *Parents through Gods grace do apprehend grace by true fayth, according to the forme of the Covenant, as well to their posterity as to themselves.* Which he oftentymes repeateth. And likewise in Confes. cap. 4. sect. 48. and cap. 5. sect. 9. and pag. 126 M. Perkins de Sacramento Baptismi tom. 1. col. 546: *Others say, that the fayth of the Parents is also the fayth of their children, all the time of their infancy or childhood, and that because parents do by their fayth apprehend the promise both for themselves and for their children: Which opinion seemeth to me the truest of all.* The like he sayth in cap. 3. Galat. The sequele like-

Papists children saued by the fayth of their parents.

wise

wise is vndoubted. For if the fayth of Popish parents be of force to establish their very children in the Covenant of God and estate of salvation, though it reside not in them, nor be their act; much more doth it establish the parents themselues, who haue that fayth in them, and whose act it is. Nor do the instances D. Morton brings against it in his answere to the Protestants Apology, lib. 4. cap. 6. make any thing to the purpose; as that in case of necessity an hereticall Priest or Schismatike may absolue from sinnes; and an Infidell administer Baptisme. Againe: That if such as were free of a citty and are araigned of treason, should haue issue after their condemnation, their children neuertheles shall enioy the title and right of cittizens, whereof their parents were destitute. These examples (I say) are not to the purpose; because he, who is either baptized by an Infidell, or absolued by an hereticall Priest, enters not into the covenant of God and estate of salvation for ought that is in the person which baptizeth or absolueth him, but for the Sacrament of Baptisme or Pennance, which he receiueth indeed by the others administration, but hath it in himselfe. And the sonne of a traytor is not made a Cittizen, in regard of any thing that is in the father alone, but for his owne birth which appertaines to himselfe, though his Father be author thereof. But the Sacramentaries teach, that the child of a Papist is in the covenant of God and estate of salvation, not for his owne fayth (for they say he hath none) but for the beliefe of his father, which is no way possible, if the same fayth be not of force to worke the like effect in the father himselfe; seeing it belongs farre more to him, then to his child, and therefore must sooner giue him interest

ceiue in the couenant, then the child that is descended of him. For how can the fathers beliefe lay hold on the promisses and couenant of God for his children, and cannot do it for himselfe?

6. These allegations demonstrate, that by the Confession of the Protestants, the starkest Papists (such as are of beliefe that the masse, the Popes primacy, and all things else of his are good, vpright and of God) *are soldiers vnder Christ, may attaine to saluation, may be Saints; yea that there are among them both many and great Saints. That there is in the Church of Rome what so is necessary to saluation, the summe of fayth, the ground-worke, the essentiall ground-worke, the principall grounds of fayth, the aboue articles, the fundamentall heads, the necessary heads, the chiefe parts, the Ghospell of saluation, the kernell of Christianity, and all Christian good. Lastly that the Church of Rome, is a limme and member of the vniuersall Church, of the Catholike Church, a member of the true Church, and is of the family of Iesus Christ; that it is mother to the children of God, that it is the Church of God, the temple of God, the body of Christ, the Spouse of Christ, that it abides yet in the couenant, is not yet cast of, or put away, is not yet killed, but is yet aliue.* Which words plainly import that the Roman or Papist Church is a true Church in the sight of God. The summe of Protestants Confessiō touching Papists.

7. But is it credible, that such as make profession of Christian religion, should mount to that height of impiety, as dare to reiect & diuorce themselues, from that Church which they confesse remaynes yet in the couenant of God, & which Christ hath not yet reiected? Is it credible, that they feare not to impugne, to make bitter inuectiues, to disgorge curses and execrations against her, whom they acknowledge to be their Mother, which bore them to Christ, to be the Church of God, to be the body Note.

and Espouse of Christ? What can be more lewd and impious, then to rage and raile against their owne mother, against the Church of God, against the very body and Espouse of Christ? What strang and monstrous blindnes is it, not to perceiue, that whiles they confesse the church of Rome to be the church of God & Espouse of Christ, they acknowledge their owne to be the Synagogue of Antichrist and trumpet of the Diuell? For Christ cannot haue two Espouses, repugnant each to other. Now the Protestant church and church of Rome are parts so opposite, as can neuer make one. For they iarre and disagree mainely in diuers weighty points, as namely touching the canon and exposition of the Scripture, touching sacrifice and the Sacraments, touching the worship of God, & his Saints, touching the meanes to obtaine remission of sinnes, and many the like. Whereupon Beza in Confes. cap. 7. pag. 56: *We dissent* (sayth he) *from the Papists about the very summe of saluation.* And others say no lesse, as shall be shewed hereafter, in the 2. booke and 6. cap. *If ours be true Religion* (sayth S. Augustin to the Donatists which yet came neerer to Catholiks then Protestants do) *yours is superstition.* Lib. 2. ebt. Gaud. c. 11. Againe: *If our communion be the Church of Christ, yours is not Christs Church; for that is but one, which so euer it be.* And in another place: *When they approue that Church, which* (as is manifest) *we communicate with all, and they do not; by that their testimony they acknowledge themselues conuinced, and giue you plaine notice* (if you be wise) *what you ought to forgoe, and what it behoues you to cleaue to and retaine.* And S. Cyprian epistle 76: *If the Church were on Nouatus side, it was not with Cornelius.* Lib. 1. de Bapt. c. 11. Lib. ad Donat. post. collat.

Num. 4. 8. The Protestants now and then perceiue as much, when they ascertaine vs (as hath byn shewed

in the first chapter) that who so seuereth himselfe from any particular congregation, which is a true Church, excludes himselfe wholy from the church. Caluin sayth, when 4. Instit. c. 2. §. 10. he wrote thus: *We cannot graunt them (Papists) that they are the church, but the necessity of subiection & obedience will be all vs. If they be churches, the power of the keyes is in their possession. If they be churches, that promise of Christ: Whatsoeuer ye binde on earth shall be bound in heauen, takes effect in them.* M. Perkins perceiued it to, when in his explicatiō of the Creed col. 794. he sayd: *As long as any church forsakes not Christ, we may not withdraw our selues from it.* The reason is apparant, because in so doing we should depart from Christ, or Christ should be parted, euen as we are rent and disioynted from the church wherein he is. And in his Reformed Catholike tract. 22. col. 470. Where he sayth: *We ought not to deuide our selues from any nation or people, which hath not before cut it selfe of from Christ.* D. Reild likewise saw it in his 3. booke of the Church c. 47. Where he makes this acknowledgement: *Surely if he can proue that we confesse it (the Church of Rome) to be the true Church, he needeth not vse any other argument.* But we haue clearely proued it by sundry plaine confessions of many famous Protestants. And hitherto we haue discouered how they sometyme harbour and receiue Papists into their church: now we will shew that they vse the like curtesy towards the rest. Zanchius lib. 1. de Eccl. c. 7.

CHAP. III.

That Protestants acknowledge for members of their Church, sometyme those that deny as well fundamentall as other articles of their fayth; sometymes Heretiks, Schismatiks, yea their professt and sworne enemies.

THAT they esteeme all such to be members of their Church, as swarue from the Christian fayth only in points not fundamentall; themselues in the preface of the Switzers Confession declare in these words: *Mutuall consent and agreement in the principall points of doctrine, in orthodoxe sense, and brotherly charity, with of religious antiquity thought abundantly sufficient.* And D. Whitaker cont. 4. quæst. 1. c. 2. pag. 527: *God forbid that they should be no longer of the number of the faythfull, who are in some points of a contrary opinion, so they assent in the chiefe and principall and necessary matters.* And for as much as the Protestants opinion herein is well knowne (for whē it is obiected vnto them, that their churches disagree in points of fayth, this serues them for excuse) I think it needlesse to alleage any more of their sayings. He that will may looke the Confession of Saxony cap. de Eccles. Luther tom. 7. lib. de not. Eccles. fol. 149. Melanchthon tom. 4. in ca. 3. 1. Cor Kemnitius 1. part. Examinis. tit. de bonis operibus pag. 332. Zuinglius tom. 1. in Prefat. lib. de Provident. Caluin. 4 Institut. cap 1. 4. 12. and cap. 2. 4. 1. Beza epist. 2 Zanchius in prefat. lib. de natura Dei. Hospin, part. 1. Histor. lib. 1. cap. 2. Vorstius in Anti-bellarmin. pag. 116. and others moe. And as their iudgements are different touching

touching the fundamentall articles of fayth, so in determining, who are to be accounted members of their Church their opinions are unlike. Some of the say, that the summe, the cheise and principall heads of fayth, and all things necessary to be believed are comprized in the Apostles Creed. *The principall heads of fayth* (fayth Calvin 2. Institut. c. 16 §. 18.) *are set downe in the Creed.* And it is (as D. Whitaker sayth lib. 3. de Scriptura cap. 3. sect. 1.) *a list of the cheise heads of fayth: It contaynes* (sayth M. Perkins in his Reformed Catholik col. 476.) *all points of Religion which we are necessarily to believe.* Hemingius in Syntagmate pag. 196: *It contaynes the ground work of the whole frame of Religion.* Vrsinus in Catechesi: *The summe of those things which the Ghospell proposeth unto vs to believe, that we may be partakers of Gods covenant, is comprehended in the Apostles Creed.* Pareus lib. 1. de Iustificat. cap 9. hath these words: *In the Creed is layd open the summe of that doctrine, which we must believe to salvation.* The same teacheth Luther tom. 7. in Symbol. fol. 138. Confessio Palatina in initio, prefat. Syntagmat. Confes. the French Catechisme, Brentius in Prolegomenis, pag. 244. The Catechisme of Heidleberg part. 2. Bullinger in compendio fidei lib. 6. cap. 2. and tom. 1. decad. 5. serm. 2. Polanus in Analysi. Catechismi Basle. Boysseul in confutat. Spondei p. 10. Raynolds in Apol. Thes. pag. 241. Carleton in Consensu tract. de Eccles. c. 9. The same is intimated by Zanchius lib. 1. epist. pag. 219. and by Musculus in locis tit. de Eccles. pag. 309. These men then, if the sequele of their doctrine be correspondent to the premises, must needs acknowledge, that the profession of the Apostles Creed, though ioyned with the denyall of whatsoever other articles of fayth, sufficeth to make a Protestant, and a limme of their Church.

The Apostles Creed.

And some of them they who confesse it. For Bullinger lib. cit. cap. 11. fol. 83. sayth: *All that we comprise in the 12. articles, is the true and Christian sayth, vnto which whosoeuer cleaueth, he beleeueth right, is approued of God, is iustified, and made part not of euerlasting life.* Caluin contr. Gentil. pag. 659: *The confession of sayth contayned in the Apostles Creed, ought to be inough for all modest Christians.* And Musculus in the place last quoted. *They are wonderfull vnreasonable and vnadui sed, who not content with this beliefe, exact of the saythfull, that they beleeue yet other things which are neither mentioned in the Apostles Creed, nor in baptisme.* Aretius in locis part 3. fol. 67: *The articles necessary to saluation are those, which the Creed hath set vs downe. As for the rest, since the matter cannot be decided, variety of iudgements must be borne with all.* Polanus also in the place before cited: *These articles (of the Creed.) if they be vnfaynedly beleeued suffice to purchase saluation; nor is it required we should beleeue ought besides.* And Hall in sua Roma irreconcil. sect. 1: *We are all one and the same Church, as many as in any part of the earth worship Iesu Christ the only Sonne of God, and Sauiour of the world, and professe the same common beliefe comprised in the Creed.*

Beliefe of the Apostles Creed sufficient to saluation.

2. Some of them will haue the grounds of sayth to be contained in the Creed; as Plessy lib. de Eccles. c. 5. Hercupon Marke Antony de Dominis in consil. suæ profect. pag. 18. & 20. sayth: *Restore peace and charity to all Christian Churches, which professe Christ by the essentiall cognisances of beliefe.* Others add to the Creeds the 4. generall Councels or at least one of them, as D. Andrews in Respons. ad Apol. Bellarmin. cap. 1. pag. 52: *That which is set downe in the Creeds and 4. generall councells, is to vs a sufficient obiect of sayth.* And in Tortura Torti pag. 127: *Nor do we lightly discerne and try heresy by other touch-stone, then by examining whether it be repugnant to*

The Creeds.

The Creeds & the 4. generall councels.

any of the three ancient Creeds, or 4 ancient generall councells. And Melancthon tom. 3. l. de iudicijs Synodorum fol. 389. sayth of himself, that he is not without the Church, because *he faithfully imbraceth all the articles of the Apostles and Nycen Creed*. Musculus also in the place aboue quoted puts downe this conclusion: *As many as beleeue the Apostles and Athanasius Creed, hold all the Catholike faith, and are not heretikes but Catholikes*. Some of them are of opinion, that al the fundamental points of beliefe are contayned in the Creed and decalogue; as Melancthon tom. 1. in cap. 7. Matth. pag. 402. tom. 3. in respons. ad artic. Bauar. fol. 363. Vrsinus in Miscellaneis Thes. 8. pag. 114. M. Perkins in his exposition of the Creed col. 789. Some of them say, they are in the Creed, the decalogue, and Lords prayer; as Luther tom. 7. in Enchirid. fol. 118. Beza lib. de notis Eccles. pag. 52. Keckerman lib. 1. System. Theol. 201. D. White in the preface of his way, and in his defence of the same cap. 8. pag. 54. Others reckon the 10. commandements, the Creed, the Lords prayer, & the Sacraments; as D. Whitaker cont. 1. quest. 4. cap. 4. pag. 342. (howbeit quest. 5. cap. 9. pag. 362. he omitteth Sacraments, & putteth in Catechisme in exchaunge.) Vorstius in Antibellarm. pag. 24. vnto which Iesserus lib. de bello Euchar. pag. 40. adioyneth the ministry. And these men according to their seuerall decisions concerning the fundamentall points of beliefe, must with like diuersity require in a limme of the Protestant Church either the beliefe of the Creed alone, and decalogue; or must adde besides (as each think it needfull) the Lords prayer, the Sacraments, the Catechisme, and the Ministery.

The creed and Decalogue.

The creed Decalogue, and Lords prayer.

The creed Decalogue, Lords prayer, & Sacraments. And the Ministry.

3. But sometymes they giue larger scope, & demaund farre lesse, to wit, Baptisme only, or faith

Baptisme and worship of Christ.

in Christ. *Let him (as Christianity is had (saith D. Andrewes in respons. cit. cap. 5. pag. 126) in baptisme and worship of Christ.* M. Morton in his booke of the Kingdome of Israel and the Church pag. 91: *In what place soeuer any society of men adore true God in Christ, they professe the substance of Christian Religion:* Ierlachius disput. 22. de Eccles. pag. 662: *Where soeuer baptisme remaines entier in regard of its substance, thither reacheth the territory of the Catholike Church:* Againe: *If they acknowledge true baptisme both in ours and in other congregations, they must yeld, that in the same there is likewise the Catholike Church.* And Hutterus in his Analysis of the Confession of Ausburge pag. 525: *As many as are enrolled for Christs soldiers by sacred baptisme, or at least wise are ioyned to him, by profession of saith, are euery one of them members of the Church simply taken, as it signifieth the company of them that are called.* Seraius defens. contra Bezam cap. 2. pag. 31: *As long as there remaines amongst them the new and old testament, together with the Sacrament of baptisme, and beliefe in God the Father, and in the Sonne, and holy Ghost; and they trust to be saued by the Sonne of God and his death; albeit they adioyne a number of their owne wicked forgeries, they are notwithstanding parts and members of the vniuersall Church.* The ministers of the scattered Church of the Netherlands in sua narrat. pag. 71: *No man can, nor ought to giue sentence in the Church of an others condemnation, of whome it is not publikely knowne, that he is fallen away from the foundation of the Apostolicall Confession, vttered by the mouth of Peter.* Oecolampadius epist. ad Bucerum apud Hospin. part. 2. Histor. fol. 112: *We are gladly at peace with all those that confesse with vs and teach Iesus Christ true God and true man in vnity of person.* And Bucerus apud eundem fol. 84: *We who so preach the same Christ with vs, are accounts them ours, what estimate soeuer they make of vs.* Beza de lib. notis Eccles. pag. 30: *We say it is a true*

Baptisme alone.

Luther de Notis Eccl. fol. 130.

Profession of Christ.

Profession of Christ God and man.

definition

definition of the true Church, whether generally considered or in particular, wherein it is sayd to be a company which acknowledgeth one Saviour. For (sayth he) this alone is the only ground-work of that spirituall house of God, Christ Iesus is the soule of that mysticall body, the only rule and square of that building. And the Confession of Bohemia artic. 8. defines the Catholike Church to be all Christians, That are associated in one belieue concerning Christ and the holy Trinity. The Confession of Basle artic. 5. hath this assertion: We believe the holy Christian Church &c. Wherein all those are Citizens, that confesse Iesus to be Christ, the lambe of God which taketh away the sinnes of the world, and shew openly the same belieue by works of charity. Acontius l. 3. Stratagem. Satanæ pag. 119 concludes that nothing else is necessarily to be believed, but That there is one God and Christ his Sonne, made man and raised from the dead; and that salvation is purchased by his name, and not by any other name, nor by the works of the law. And Luther vpon the 7. of Math. fol. 86. closeth vp all with this epilogue: The head and summe of Christian doctrine is this: that God sent and gaue his Sonne, by whome alone he pardoneth our offences, and doth iustify and saue vs. This (sayth he) and nothing else, it behoues thee firmely to belieue. Sometyme to belieue their article of iustification by only fayth is as much as they require in a limme of their Church, or think needfull to saluation. Luther tom. 7. tract. in 3. symbol. fol. 140: I haue found by experience, that who so haue truly and sincerely believed that principall article of Christian fayth concerning Iesus Christ, though they had their errours and faults, haue at last notwithstanding byn saued. And tom. 4. in cap. 42. Isaiæ fol. 178: If we abide in this article, we are secure from heresies, and retaine remission of sinnes; which pardoneth our weaknes in ciuill duties and belieue. And in cap. 43. fol. 200: Who so belieueth the article, is out of danger for euer falling into any error,

To acknowledge one Saviour.

The faith of Christ and the Trinity.

Belieue of one God & Christ.

That God saueth by Christ.

The only article of iustification sufficeth.

Parens in 1. Galat. lect. 8.

Iur lar. de bello Iuch. fol. 37.

error, and the holy Ghost must needs assist him. And Brocard. Vpon the 2. cap. of the Apocalips fol. 45: *The former Ministers, who were before the first councell of Trent, determined, that we ought not to contend, but that their Supper should be common, which had received one doctrine touching iustification.* Caluin de vera Eccles. reform. pag. 316. writeth thus: *I know it is the common saying of a great many, that so the doctrine of vndeserued iustification continue sound, we should not be so stifly contentious about the rest.* And the Author of the Preface in Syntagma Confess. after he had affirmed that the article of iustification is the ground work, the forme and soule of Christian religion, makes this demaund: *How can they then but haue peace one with another, who soeuer are fellow-partners of so great good?* And he saith, it is, *An vnseemly and heinous thing, that betweene such there should be enmity and debate.* And indeed all Protestants should teach so, since they make this article the definition, the summe, and very soule of Protestantisme, as shall be hereafter shewed in the 6. chapter. Sometymes in a member of their Church, they require only some one point of Christianity, or but the profession of Christs name. For Sturmius apud Hospin. in Concord. discord. c. 24. testifieth that Bucer sayd:

Any point of Christianity.

He would neuer condemne any one, in whome he saw any point of Christianity. And Plessy lib. de Eccles. cap. 2. affirmeth that the Church may be infected with heresy from top to toe, & yet be a part of the vniuersall Church, *as long as it professeth the name of Christ.* And Moulins in his buckler of fayth pag. 43. *The vniuersall visible Church is the company of all them who professe themselues to be Christians.* Thus we see, that to *a member of the visible Church*, yea to sayth, *to Christianity*, *to a member of the true and Catholike Church*, *to eternall salvation* (as Protestants sometyme iudge and determine) little or nothing sufficeth.

Do not these men go about to expose the Church & meanes of saluation vnto scorne and mockery? What Iew or Turke did euer make his Synagogue so common?

4. Albeit the former allegations do sufficiently conuince, that when Protestants calculate the limmes and members of their Church, they take, to make vp the number, such as renounce the very fundamentall articles of their belicfe; yet to make it more euident, and to preuent all colour of doubt, I will adde other proofes besides. And first we haue in this behalfe their owne Confessions. For Beza lib. de Notis Eccles. pag. 45. teacheth plainly, that *some errours euen in some fundamentall heads of fayth, may creep into the Catholike Church*. And D. Whitaker cont. 2. quest. 4. cap. 3. pag. 490: *It is manifest, that the true Church may erre for a tyme euen in necessary points*. The like hath Hutterus in Analysi Confessionis Augustanæ pag. 454. and Iunius doth intimate as much lib. 3. de Eccles. cap. 17. D. Whitaker againe cont. 2. quest. 5. cap. 17: *We gather, that the Church may for a tyme swarue from the truth euen in some fundamentall points, and be notwithstanding safe*. And Zanchius lib. 1. epist. pag. 221. will not haue vs forsake any cõpany on occasion of false opinions, *which swarue from the groundwork of fayth*. D. Hall likewise in sua Roma irreconc. sect. 1. fayth, that the true Church may foster such errours, *as by deduction and consequence destroy the foundations of belicfe*. D. Fulke in his serm. vpõ the Apocalips, hauing made this obiection to himselfe, that seing the Church is the Espouse of Christ, it cannot be, that he suffered it to be possessed so many ages with damnable errors; answeares it in this manner: *What? Christ himselfe hath fayd: that the errors of false Prophets should be exceeding great, in as much as the very elect,*

Protestãts challenge those that deny eũ fundamẽtall articles.

elect, if it might be, should be led into errour. And lib. de Succes. Eccles. pag. 122. he sayth: *It seemes not fitting to take from the Grecians the name of a Church*; whome notwithstanding he confesseth to be ensnared with grieuous errors. Now a grieuous errour (according to D. Whitaker cont. 2. quest 4. cap. 1.) *dissolues the foundation, and may therefore be termed fundamentall*. M. Perkins in his exposition of the Creed, col. 790: *When an errour is repugnant to the foundation, either directly or by necessary consequence of it proceed of weakenes, he in whome it is, ought to be reputed a member of the vniuersall Church*. And vpon 1. Galat. v. 2: *If a Church through frailty fall into errour, although it concerne the foundation, notwithstanding it remaynes yet a Church, as is certaine by the example of the Galathians*. And vpon the epistle of Iude v. 19: *The Church of Galatia through weaknesse reuolted from vnto another Ghospell, and erred in the foundation, yet Paul writeth to it as to the Church of God*. D. Willet affirmeth the same in his Synopsis cont. 2. q. 3. pag. 104. And Melanchton tom. 2. lib. de Eccl. pag. 123. toucheth the same string when he sayth: *The true Church it selfe may haue errours which obscure and darken the articles of fayth*. And tom. 4. in cap. 9. Rom: *God gathereth alwayes some company, in which the foundation is kept, sometymes lesse pure, sometymes more*. D. White in his way pag. 111: *Some articles lying in the very foundation may be beleeued not so clearly*. Nay sometymes they dare auouch, that those very Corinthians that denyed the resurrection, and those Galatians also that changed the Ghospell of Christ into another Ghospell, were of the Church. For thus the Switzers Confession c. 17: *We are not ignorant, what manner of Churches those of the Corinthians and Galathians were in the Apostles tyme: which the Apostle accuseth of many and grieuous crimes, and yet termeth them the holy Churches of Christ*. And Calvin 4. Institut.

Luther. in 1. cap. Galat. fol. 123. Perkins loc. cit.

cap. 2.

cap. 2. §. 27: *Most grieuous sinnes possesse sometymes whole Churches. The Apostasy of the Galathians was no small offence, the Corinthians were lesse excusable then they; howbeit neither of them are excluded from the Lords mercy.* Sadeel in his answere ad Thes. Posnan. cap. 12. pag. 866: *The Galathians and Corinthians, though corrupted with errour, and disagreeing each from other about the cheife groundwork of beliefe, and that not concerning the manner but touching the matter it selfe, retained notwithstanding the name of a true Church.* And hence he gathereth, that the debate and disagreement betweene the Lutherans and Caluinists concerning the Eucharist, doth not let either of them from being of the true Church.

Lutherans professe that themselues differ fundamentally.

5. The deeds of the Lutherans and Sacramentaries yeld vs a second kind of proofe. For the Electorall or milde Lutherans in colloq. Aldeburg. scripto 8. call themselues, *Fellowes and companions of the same Ministery, fellow-citizens and fellow-souldiers* of those of Saxony or rigorous Lutherans: of whome notwithstanding scripto 6. pag. 121. they giue this censure: *They haue shewed themselues to dissent from our Churches in the foundation.* Againe: *We will make it euident, that they impugne the fundamentall doctrine.* And scripto 4. pag. 4: *Our opinion is, that we disagree not about inferiment matters only, or things of no consequence; but about the maine and cheife matters.* And scripto 7: *This one thing they aymed at, and bent all their endeauours to vndermine and ouerturne the groundwork of sauing doctrine.* And pag. 374. they complaine that those of Saxony *do often cry out of them, that they are worse then any idolaters.* And the Sacramentaries in Præfat. Apologet. Orthodoxi consensus, write thus of the Lutherans: *They haue hitherto suffered among them, such as call in question the doctrine of iustification, of original sinne, of free will, of the Ghospell, of the law and vse thereof, of Christs*

defects

no such came to him, it is manifest that there were no such at all. Finally this is manifest otherwise. For suppose, that before Luther they lay so close, as that they worshipped God only in hart and soule, yet when they saw Protestancy to be preached publiquely and securely, and that they might live openly and amongst men, who will imagine, that they would preferre darcknes before light, and lurking holes before townes and cities, and alwayes keep in deserts? Certaidly such kind of fellowes should be rather batts or owles, then men. Besides being iust men, forsooth, why did they not afford God externall worship where they might securely doe it? Why did they not according to Christs commandement celebrate the memory of his Passion by receiuing of the Sacraments?

4. Out of these I compose the seauenth demonstration: *If after that Luther securely preached Protestancy, neuer any ancienter Protestant came forth and adioyned himself to his company, there were no Protestants before. But no such euer came forth. Ergo.* But if there were no Protestant before Luther, vndoubtedly he was the beginner of that company.

That the Protestant Church, and Religion is new.

CHAP. XIII.

THE eighth demonstration with which we will proue, that Luther was the beginner of the Protestant Church and religion, we will frame out of Protestats Confessions of the nouelty therof. First therefore

therfore they say, that in the iudgment almost of all men it is new, and that it is almost impossible, to wipe away from it the spot of nouelty. Thus Illyricus in the Preface of his Catalogue: *When Doctours rayſed of God preach the (Protestant) gospell and doe inueigh against contrary errors, they seeme in the iudgement almost of all men to bring a new doctrine vnheard of before and to impugne the old.* Againe: *It is very hard and almost impossible to remoue the hatefull marck of nouelty from the (Protestant) doctrine.* To which D. Fulke lib. de Succeſſ. pag. 454. addeth that the Protestant religion, *We altogether new to most nations.*

Now in almost all mens iudgement.

Almost impoſſible.

2. Secondly in equiualent words they oftentymes call their Religion new or begun of new. For as we shal straight rehearse they terme it *in the blade, renascent, reuiuing, borne a new, renewed, repayred, restored, rayſed againe, resuscitated.* And what can be meant by these termes, but a religion either new or newly erecteth, such as Christs religion is not? For neither is it new in it selfe, neither can it be begun or rayſed anew, because it can neuer fall. Luther in cap. 22. Geneſ. tom. fol. 208. writeth thus: *In the beginning of the gospell borne a new, Monetarius &c.* In cap. 31. fol. 434: *Nine assemblies haue beene held since the Ghoſpell began to be borne a new.* In cap. 32. fol. 458 *After the light of the Ghoſpell was borne againe.* In cap. 48. fol. 642. *At the beginning of the Ghoſpell rising againe.* In cap. 49. fol. 662. *They desire to extinguish the light of the Ghoſpell rising againe.* In cap. fol. 342. *I remember that before these tymes of the Ghoſpell borne a new.* And in the Præfat. Deuter. tom. 3. Ienen. fol. 75. *The rising againe or rather springing Ghoſpell.* Thus speaketh Luther. Melanct hon Apol. pro Luthero tom. 2. Lutheri fol. 194. *You oppose against the rising light of the Ghoſpell.* And reſponſ. ad Cletum Colon. tom. 2. pag. 97.

Borne a-new.

Borne a-gaine.

Riſing a-gaine.

The

renewed. *The beginning of the pure doctrine rising againe.* And in cap. 7 Matth. tom. 1. fol. 398: He termeth *it renewed doctrine.* Carion in Chron. pag. 706. calleth their Church *the renascent Church.* Iustus Ionas Epist. dedicat. lib. Lutheri de Iudæis tom. 7. fol. 166. *God would that in our time the Gospel should be borne againe vnder the house of Saxony.*

reuiuing. Besoldus in his Preface of the 4. part of Luthers Cometarie vpon Genes. hath these words: *In the begining of the Church borne anew.* Osiander in his Manual englished pag. 62: *Our doctrine is renewed.* And his sonne Lucas Epist. Euchar: *The doctrine of the gospel borne againe.*

Christianity greene, The author of the Sponge in Daneus pag. 13. calleth *it the light of the Ghospell borne againe, the Euangelicall doctrin reuiuing or quickning againe.* Kemnice in locis part. 2. p. 106. *In the beginning of the Ghospell borne againe.* Amongst the Sacramentaryes Zuinglius speaketh thus in supplicat. ad Suithenses fol 121: *Christianity being greene, christianity rising againe.* And in Eccles. fol. 41. *New born truth.* Which phrase he repeateth dispur. tom. 2. fol. 607. Gesnerus in Bibliotheca sayth of Luther: *The new borne Church doth owe much vnto him.* Muscle Epist. dedicat. locorum. *I was in the beginning of the new rising Euangelicall truth.* Bucer in Retract. pag. 641. vseth these words: *Among the Ministers of the recalled Ghospell.* Beza in cap. 3. Rom. v. 20. *They by whose Ministery God in our age hath recalled to light Christs Ghospell almost buryed.* Gualter. Præfat. in Rom. *How much harme the Anabaptists did at the beginning of the new borne Ghospell.* Martyr in locis tom. 2. pag. 228. *In the beginning of the Ghospell born againe.* And in Epist. dedicat. comment. ad Rom. *The Ghospell quickning againe.* Hospin. Epist. dedicat. 1. part. histor. *The Euangelicall truth borne againe.* Sohlnus in Methodo Theol. pag. 215. *Among the Doctours of the Church borne againe.* And Caluin 4. Institut. cap. 7. §. 24. The

Recalled Ghospell.

beginning of the new born Ghospell.

Quickning againe.

24. *The doctrine of the Ghospell borne againe.* lib. de scand. pag. 76. & 94. *The ghospell borne againe.* Admonit. 2. ad Westphalum pag. 784. *The Ghospell is borne againe.* And cont. Scripturum pag. 592. *Of the Ghospell borne againe.* And in like manner he speaketh ordinarily. Sadel respo. ad Arthurum cap. 7. *The Church borne againe.* Paræus in Miscellan. Vrsini pag. 26. *The light of the Ghospell borne againe.* Danæus respons. ad Solnec. pag. 1565: *In the very beginning of the Ghospell borne againe.* Plessie de Eccles. cap. 11: *Christ borne againe.* Cambden in apparatu Annalium: *The rising religion of Protestants.* Vsher de Succes. cap. 8. *In the beginning of the Ghospell born againe.* Scult. in Præfat. 4. partis Medullæ: *Then were in the floure of the Church borne againe.* Moreouer Luther tom. 1. in dis. fol. 410. calleth his doctrine, *a doctrine repayred in this age.* And Præfat. ad Galat. tom. 5. fol. 270. sayth: *In these later tymes the holesome knowledge of Christ was againe resuscitated.* Iames Andrewes lib. cont. Hosium pag. 1. *The Lord by the Ministery of Luther hath resuscitated the doctrine of the Ghospell.* And pag. 349: *Among our men after the doctrine of the Ghospell was resuscitated.* Kenice Præfat. in lib. de vnione hypostat: *It is now three score yeares since the ancient serpent raised against the heresy of Berengarius for to oppresse as they sayen the blade the doctrine of the Ghospell then first restored by Luthers Ministery.* Caluin l. de Cœna cap. 10: *This controuersie began betweene them, who were the chiefest captaines in restoring the doctrine of the ghospell, and bringing it backe as it were when it was lost.* Lib. de libero arbit. pag. 147. *The purity of the Ghospell was restored by Luthers labour especially.* Et epist. ad Ducem Somersetti; *God would haue me to be one of those by whose labour he restored this tyme the sincere doctrine of the Ghospell.* Danæus in method. scripturæ pag. 400: *There are 54. yeares past since that tyme that the pure light and doctrine of the Ghospell*

Christ borne againe.

In the floure of the Church.

repayred.

Resuscitated.

Ghospell in the blade.

Restored.

pellum first restored to the world. Apol. Eccles. Angl. part. pag. 64. It is no new thing though at this day the religion of Christ be entertained with despite and checks being but lately restored and as it were comming vp againe a new. Ibid. cap. 17. Our desire was to haue the temple of the Lord restored a new. Iezier de bello Euchar. fol. 72: Euen from the beginning of the restored Euangelicall light. M. Bancroft in his Survey cap. 8. In this later age of the world it hath pleased God to restore vs the light of the Ghospell. And M. Alenson in præt. contro. 4. Whitakeri: After the restauration of the Ghospell. And many more (as we see in the chapter following) call their ghospell restored Religion. By which it may appeare that D. Andrewes Respons. ad Apol. Bellarm. cap. 1. did vntruly deny, that their men call their fayth a restored fayth. But whiles he denyeth that their men termeth it so, he clearely sheweth, what those meane who terme it so, to wit, that they meane a religion borne or framed a new, according to the very substance thereof. And in truth what els could they meane by so many termes and so often repeated of a religion greene in the blade, borne againe, rising againe, resuscitated, renewing, reuiuing, recalled, repaired, brought backe againe, restored, but a religion substantiall produced, instituted and founded a new.

3. Thirdly this is proued, because they write, that in the tyme of Luther, of Melanchon, of Zuinglius, of the Anabaptists and such others, was the beginning, the very beginning, the first beginning, the originall, the entrance, the cradle, the dawning, the new rising of their Church and religion, as appeareth in the aforesayd testimonies of Luther, Melanchon, Besoldus, Kemnicius, Musculus, Gualter, Peter Martyr, Danæus, Vsserius, Gezler. And besides, Luther in cap. 3. Genes. tom. 6. fol. 33. hath these words: In the beginning

of the Ghospell, Carolost adium &c. Georgius Fabritius lib. 8. Orig. Saxon. pag. 13. *God would that true and holesome doctrine should haue her beginning in the vniuersity of VVittemberg.* Caluin epist. ad Montisbelgardenses col. 590. edit. 1617: *In this our age the ghospel did flow out of the church of VVittemberg.* Brentius Practat. lib. Andreæ contra Hosium: *Did not we all in the beginning of the reuealed ghospell with one mouth disproue your Popish impietyes?* And in Recognit. pag. 327: *They cannot deny, that, euen from the beginning of the reborne ghospell, the Zuinglians &c.* And l. de Maiest. Christi pag. 109: *Euen from the beginning of the reuealed ghospell, Melanchton &c.* Wittebergenses in Resut. Orthodoxi consensus pag. 22. *Luther recited some things which in the beginning of the reborne doctrine of the ghospell he graunted to the Papists.* Lobechius disput. 12. *Straight after the beginning of the shining truth, in the yeare 1520. &c.* Pappus defens. 1. cont. Sturmium pag. 19. *Then sayest that there were no such Professed published since the beginning of religion, I shew thee the contrary that Luther and Philip. held the same.* Sleidan prefat. histor: *The beginning (of Protestancy) was slender and almost contemptible, and one only (Luther) bore the brunt of all the world.* Zanchius lib. de perseuerat. 192: *In the beginning of the Ghospell the sect of Anabaptists arose.* Caluin epist. 63: *If in the first beginning of the church rising againe, this example of tyranny doth now peep, what will be shortly?* And epist. 178: *In the beginning of the ghospell borne againe.* Epist. 269. *The beginnings of the kingdome of Christ euery where in our age were almost base and contemptible.* Respons. ad Sadolet p. 133: *After the new rising of the ghospell.* Plessie de Eccles. cap. 17. *VVhat shall we thinke that the new starre anno (1572.) did betoken but the new birth of Christ on earth by preaching of the word.* And he addeth, that as Christ first borne put the Idols oracles to silence, so borne againe he hath made the Popish mi-

Protestancy had its beginning in Wittenberg.

Anabaptists in the beginning of Protestantisme.

New tysing.

New birth.

racles to vanish. Scultete part. 1. Medullæ in Irenæo cap. 9. *In this age the dawning of the Euangelicall truth hath shined a new vnto vs.* Zuinglius lib. de Prouid. tom. 2. fol 352: *The Lantgraue laboureth that the infancy of Religion be piously nourished.* And Gesner in Bibliotheca sayth: *Luther did happily set forward the infancy of Religion.* The Apology of the Church of England part. 2. c. 2. diuis. 1. writeth, that Anabaptists, and Libertynes *haue beene stirring in the world euer since the ghospell did first spring.* M. Powel de Antichristo c. 32. *How many wars haue beene since the light of the ghospell arose, the Heluetian, the Protestant warre &c.* Vllerius l. de Succes. Eccl. c. 8. *At the beginning of the ghospell beeue againe, Thomas Bilney &c.* M. Bale cont. 8. cap. 68. speaking of the beginning of protestancy, calleth it, *The rising of the new Hierusalem.* Horne in his Harbour, *The second birth of Christ.* And Brocard in cap. 2. Apocal: *the second comming of Christ. But surely if the yeare 1520. were streight after the beginning of Protestancy: If Luther, Melanchon, Zuinglius, the Anabaptists, and such like were from the beginning, at the beginning, and streight after the Rising of Protestancy: If the dissention amongst Protestants, were in the first beginning of their Church: If finally Protestant doctrine had its beginning in the Church of Vvittemberge & flowed from thence,* without doubt it is a new doctrine and Church, which either had neuer bern before, or was newly founded and restored. Besides what other thing can signify *The new rising, the new birth, the second comming of Christ,* but another substantiall beginning and repayring of Christs religion and Church after it had been quit ouerthrowne. The same also they insinuate, when they say, that the light of the ghospell was in their tyme new kindled, or lightned againe. Luther tom. 2. fol. 305. alias 307. *God in this last tyme hath kindled againe the light of the ghospell.* And in

The dawning.

The infancy.

Second birth.

Second comming

Kindled againe.

cap.

cap. 17. Genes. tom. 6. fol. 210. *He hath kindled againe for vs the light of the Ghospell.* Melancthon in cap. 11. Dan. tom. 1. fol. 314. *God hath againe kindled for vs the light of the ghospell*, which againe he repeateth in his common places tit. de gratia. The same hath Vitus Theodorus Præfat. Comment. Luth. in Psalm. Kemnitius in locis tit. de Iustificat. pag. 109. 247. The Elector in Edicto de lib. concord. & Zuinglius Præfat. Elench. tom. 2. fol. 5. sayth: *Christ hath lighted againe in our tyme the lanterne of his word.* Wherefore falsly doth Boysseul in confutat. Spondæi pag. 25. deny, that their men say they kindle a new the doctrine of salvation. But (as before I sayd of D. Andrewes) Boysseul by denying that their men say they kindle againe the doctrin sheweth vs, that those who indeed say so, do meane of a substantiall production of light, as in truth the word kindling doth signify.

42. Fourthly I proue the novelty of the Protestant Church and religion, because they doe sometymes in plaine termes call it *new, fresh, vnused, vnaccustomed newly planted, altogether new, and newly erected.* Luther Præfat. formulæ Missæ tom. 2. fol. 384. *I was always slow and carefull for the weaklings in sayth, from whome could not suddenly be taken old and inured, nor vnpatient so fresh & vnaccustomed manner of serving God.* In psalm. 45. tom. 3. fol. 439. he sayth: *Neither was there ever any new worde vttered without miracle.* Which after he had proued by the example of Abraham, Moyses and Christ, he addeth: *So we also have our Miracles.* And in cap. 19. Gen. tom. 6. fol. 238. he sayth, that Papists do sore vrge med. them saying: *Your doctrine is new and vnknowne to our forefathers*, which he answering, denyeth not that his doctrine is new, but rather granteth it, saying: *What belongeth it to vs what God hath iudged of those who dyed before.*

Fresh and vnaccustomed.

before. Now the word is preached vnto vs, we must not be inquirers why or why God hath reuealed his doctrine at this time and not in former ages. And in cap. 12. fol. 148. he writeth in these words: *Heere surely Abraham doth shew no small trouble of conscience which euen in his banishment is wounded with this dart, to thinke in this sort: Looke to it, Thou art all alone a stranger, where soeuer thou goest thou carriest with thee a new and strange religion. Art thou alone only? hath God care of thee only, and hath he cast off so many people and nations? The like* (sayth Luther) *we also suffer when our aduersaryes with open mouth demand of vs, Are all they wrong before vs, and followed the Popes religion damned?* Yee see how plainly he intimateth his trouble of conscience about the newnesse and strangenes of his religion. And in Appendice confess. in Hospin. part. 2. fol. 188. he sayth: *Because our doctrine seemed at that time very new and wonderfull scandalous to the whole world, it behoued me to deale modestly.* And in the Epitaphe of his tombe is engraued this verse:

Seemed very new to the whole world.

A new light of the Ghospell he spred throughout the world.

Melancthon Præfat. in tom. 2. Luther thus speaketh of him: *He did so illustrate these writings, that after a long & darke night there seemed to the iudgment of all pious and prudent men to arise a new light of doctrine.* The vniuersity of Wittemberg in Sentent. de Missa in Luthero tom. 2. fol. 349. writeth that the abolishing of priuate Communion: *Is in this time a thing altogether new.* As Luther ibidem fol 385. sayth that Communion vnder both kinds, *is a rite euer new.* Spalatine whome Protestants account a very graue man in his relation of the Confession of Ausburg sayth: *Such a confession was neuer made not only a thousand yeares ago, but not since the beginning of the world, neither in any history nor in any ancient Father or Doctor is such a Confession to be heard of.* Huber in Antibellarminum

New in the iudgment of al wise men.

Neuer such a confession.

minum libro 4. capite. 3. *Our Church hath a new forme not vsed at that tyme when the Pope had all.* Wittembergenses in Prefat: Refutat. Orthodoxi Consensus call the Protestant Church lately planted, and as yet tender, George Fabritius libro 7. Orig. Saxon. pag. 858. speaking of protestancy sayth: *Duke George is greatly against this new doctrine, who was deceiued by the ancient vse of his forefathers.* And lib. 8. pag. 21. writeth that euen the Prince Electour himselfe at the first did not much defend Luthers reformatio *as being new*. And Freschelius Archdeacon of Wittemberg Preface in Comment Melanchthonis in Math. calleth the Protestants company according to the age therof *a Childish campe*. In like sort doe the Sacramentaries speake, for thus Zuinglius Pareneti ad ciuitatem Suithensem tom. 1. fol. 110. *First of all in humble manner we entreat this, that our cause doe not seeme to you absurd by reason of the newnesse therof.* And in Supplicat. ad Suithenses he doth almost openly confesse that *he goeth about to ginne men new precepts and lawes.* And those of Zurich in Sleidan lib. 4. write that *their ministers doe teach them now fiue yeares, and that at the begining this kind of doctrine seemed new, because they had neuer heard any such thing before.* Sadeel de vocat. pag. 443: *God hath brought into light the reborne Church as a yongling*, and pag. 555. that he hath *layd a new foundation of the Church, and erected againe the Church.* Caluin Respons. ad Sadolet pag. 131. maketh a man speake thus to God in defence of his becomming a Protestant: *I being offended at the newelty, did hardly giue eare vnto it.* Bullingius epist. dedicat. Catechis: *It seemed good to God in our time to erect his Church a new.* Beza in Confess cap. 4 sect. 49: *God would preserue the reliques of his Church in Poperie till he had erected it againe.* The Apologie of the English Church part. 4. cap. 4. Diuis. 2:

Lately planted.

New doctrine.

A childish campe.

Seemed new.

A new foundation.

Erected a new.

Erected againe.

Forty yeares ago and vpward it was an easy thing for them to deuise against vs these accursed speeches and obiections, when in the midst of the darknesse of that age it first began to spring and to giue shine some one glimmering beame of truth vnknowne at that time and vnheard of, when as yet the thing was but new & the successe thereof vncertaine, and when there could be imagined against vs no fact so detestable but that the people then would soon beleiue it for the nouelty and straungenesse of the matter. Ibid. diuis. 1: *How often haue they set on fire Princes houses to the end they might quench the light of the gospell in the very first appearing of it.* M. Fox in his Acts set forth anno 1610. pag. 788. writing what passed anno 1523 speaketh thus: *Then the doctrine of Luther first beganne to spring and being but in the blade, was not yet knowne whereto it tended, nor to what it would grow.* D. Rainolds in his Conference cap. 5. sect. 2. sayth that Protestants *haue not had long tract of time.* And a late Chronicler, thought to be M. Goodwin writing the life of K. Henry 8. 1521. sayth: *In the meane time our king moued at the nouelty of Luthers doctrine* &c. To all which I adde, that Erasmus (whome Protestants as is before shewed doe challenge as one of theirs) writeth thus to the Brethren of the low coutreis: *do not they bring a new Gospel, who expound it otherwise then the Church hitherto hath done?*

But in the blade.

New Ghospell.

But Why I pray you should the Protestants religion seeme new to all the world, and in the indgement of all pious and prudent men, if indeed it were not new? How should so many, so famous Protestants, so often, and in so many different kinds of writings, to wit in prose, in verse, in peaceable, in contentious writings, in Historicall, in dogmaticall, in speech to men & to God himselfe haue sayd so plainly and so many wayes, that Protestant religion was *new, fresh, vnwonted, vnused, wholy new, newly planted, & erected*

erected anew if they had not thought that it was indeed new. For as Luther ſayth: *It is impoſſible but that the conſcience will ſome time bewray it ſelfe.*

5. If any anſweare that the ſore ſayd Proteſtants dee not meane, that their religion was abſolutely new. Firſt I aske, why then doe they abſolutely ſay ſo, and that ſo often and in ſo many kind of writings? Why do they ſo often and in ſo weighty a matter write otherwiſe then they think? Beſides, it cannot be proued, that they did not meane that it was abſolutely new when they ſpake ſo, otherwiſe then becauſe perhappes at other times they ſayd the contrary. Which kind of proofe in Heretikes is friuolous, as partly hath bin ſhewed before, partly ſhall be more hereafter. Moreouer this is like the excuſe of the Marcioniſts, who whe they had brought in a new God, yet would not haue him to be called abſolutely new, but *only newly knowne or diſcouered.* Proteſtãts firſt refuted.

6. Fiftly I proue the nouelty of Proteſtant religion becauſe euen then when in words they deny it to be new, in very deed they confeſſe it to be new in ſuch ſort as ſufficeth for me to proue that Luther was the Author therof, and that it is not the religion of Chriſt, to wit, that it is of new erected, built & ſet vp according to the very ſubſtance and eſſence therof in ſuch ſort as a houſe falle downe but newly raiſed in walls, roofe and other ſuch ſubſtantiall parts may be called a new houſe; Becauſe Chriſts Church and religion cannot be new in this ſort, being ſuch as can neuer fall. For they confeſſe, that the antiquity of their Church was abrogated, and that it is a religion refined and reformed, and that they are refiners and reformers. D. Morton 1. part. Apol. lib 1. cap vlt. writeth that Proteſtants *Chal-*

lenge the first antiquity, but abrogated by mens fault. Iunius Cont. 4. lib. 4. cap. 7 sayth: *The continuance of the old and Catholike doctrine is renewed.* But surely that thing whose antiquity hath bin abrogated and broken of, is new. For the kingdome in Cæsars time was new in Rome although it began with the citty it selfe, because it had bin abrogated for diuers ages, Wherupon Riuet Epitom. Cont. tract. 3 cap. 21 sayth: *Things are called new, when they are renewed and vsed after interruption.* Besides whether a thing once abrogated and taken away and afterward restored be to be called new or no, it sufficeth to me, that the Protestant religion is in such sort new, as a house fallen downe and newly raised may be called new: because the Church & religion of Christ cannot be new in this manner, nor the antiquity ther of, abrogated, and cut of. In like fort Musele in locis tit. de noua doctrina pag. 417: Albeit he deny that they make new doctrine yet he confesseth that they renew doctrine, And that he meaneth of a substantiall renouation wherin the very substance of a thing is renewed, It appeareth by the precedent page where he sayth that *old matters abrogated & fallen down for some ages are renewed.* A Church therfore and religion fallen downe they doe renew, that is, erect a new. Wherupon the French Confession, Beza, & Bastingius as is before recited say that their Church *is againe, & a new erected,* and others cal her a Church *Reuiued, resuscitated, reborn* and assigne a new birth and begining of her, which words doe manifestly signifie a new substantial production or making of her: which whether it be called a nouatiō or renouatiō, maketh not much to the purpose, seing it is either a substantial production or first making of that which neuer had bin before, or

a re-

a reproduction and second making of that, which though it had bin before, yet was fallen, and the substance therof corrupted and perished. Of which nouation or renouation Luther was the Author, Besides they call themselues *Renewers or Refiners*, and their Church or religion *Reformed or refined*. D. Andrewes Respons. ad Apol. Bellarm. cap. 1: *We are Renewers: We call our religion reformed*. Caluin Epist. 341: *We carry the name of the reformed Church*. Iunius lib. 4. de Eccles. cap. 16: *We hold the Reformed Christian faith*. And in the same sort speaketh the Scots Confession, the Consent of Poland, D Whitaker Prefat. cont. & cont. 1. quest. 2. c. 16. & 17. & cont. 2. quest. 5. c. 2. & others commonly. Take therfore what kind of forme of religion haue they taken away by their reformation, and what a one haue they giuen? Surely they haue changed the very substantiall forme. For (to omit al other points) they haue taken away the former manner of obtayning remission of sinnes by the Catholike faith and good workes, and brought in a new of obtayning the same by special faith only, and vndoubtedly the way to obtaine remissiō of sins, is substantiall to a Church and religiō. But they who take away the substantiall forme and bring a new, doe make a new thing, and such a mutation ought rather to be termed a formation, then reformation. But whether it be called a formation or reformation, it skilleth little, it sufficeth (as I sayd) that it is a substantiall mutation of religion, the Author whereof Luther was, and such a mutation, as cannot happen to the religion and Church of Christ. Moreouer, it is the shift of old and new heretiques to bring in new religions vnder the name of Reformation. Of the Marcionists thus writeth Tertullian: *They say that Marcion*

Protestats call themselues reformers.

Marcion did not so much emmonate the rule (of faith) as reser-
L. 1. cont. Mar. c. 20. *me that which before was corrupted.* And he himselfe after he was become a Montanist: *Thu is shewed of vs, that the discipline of Monogamie is neither new nor strange, yea both auncient and proper to Christians, that you may think the Paraclete (Montanus) to haue bin rather the Restorer then beginner therof.* And of Seruetus thus write thole of Zurick in Caluin cont Seruet. pag. 626. *He goeth on to thrust vpon the Church a most corrupt doctrine vnder the shew of restitution of Christianity.*

7. Sixtly, because the Protestants designe the place, the occasion, the yeare, day, and hower, when Protestancie began: The place we haue heard already out of Caluin and Fabritius was Wittemberg, & the same doth Luther insinuate in cap. 49. Isaiæ tom. 4. fol. 192 saying: *Now VVittenberg is blasphemed as the fountaine of all heresies, but it will come to passe some yeares hence that it shall be praised of Posterity, as Gods garden from whence the Gospell was propagated into Germanie and all parts of the world.* And Mathew Iudex in Edicto æterni dei: *That clamour against Antichrist came out of the durty townes of barbarous and base Germany.* A fit place no doubt from whence so durty, filthy, and barbarous an heresy should spring. Forsooth Wittemberge is the Protestants Syon, from whence their law should come. S. Austin thought it ridiculous madnesse, that the Donatists should say that the Church was to be renewed out of Africa the third part of the world, & shall we think it wisedom to imagine that it should be renewed out of a durty and barbarous corner of Duchland? The occasion of it was Tezelius his preaching of Indulgences, for thus writteth Cruſius L. 10. Anal. Sueu. pag. 518. *Tezelius boldnesse stirred vp Luthers mind to set vp conclusions against those indulgences on the gates of the temple of*

The place where Protestacy began.

protestancy began in a durty towne of a barbarous coũtry.

De vnit. c. 7.

The occasion of the beginning of protestancy.

All

Saints in Wittemberg the last day of October which was saturday. Hence now came the occasion & beginning (sayth he) of correcting the christian religion. Schutzelburg Præf. tom. 8. Catal. hæret: *Old men remember & it recorded in writing for remembrance for euer and publiquely extant, that this was the cause that the Gospell flourished againe in our age, that Iohn Tetzele carryed about pardons of sinnes to be sold in the Popes name.* And Kemnice 4. part. Exam. tit. de Indulgentijs pag. 78: *It is knowne to all the world, that the impudent, and impious sale of pardons about 50. yeares ago gaue entrance to the holesome repurging of heauenly doctrine.* And Manlius in Calendario: *On All Saints eue first of all conclusions against Indulgences were fastned by Luther vpon the gate of the Church of Wittemberg castle in the yeare 1517. at twelue of the clocke.* The same say Melancthon Præfat. in tom. 2. Luther. Sleidan, Carion, and others. We haue then the place where, to wit, Wittemberg, the yeare 1517. the day of the month, the last of October, the day of the weeke, Saturday, and finally the very houre, to wit, twelue of the clocke, when first Protestancy began to arise. And as Vincent. Lyrin. sayth: *What hereticke was there which sprung not vp vnder some certaine name in a certaine place, and time.*

The day of the weeke & month.

The yeare & houre.

Cap. 34.

8. Seauenthly I proue the nouelty of Protestancy by the mutual testimony of the Lutherans against the Sacramentaries, and of the Sacramentaries against the Lutherans. For of the Sacramentaries doctrine thus testifieth Luther in defens. verborū Cœnæ tom. 7 fol. 381. *Neither doth any thing set forth this heresie more then nouelty.* And tom. 2. Zuinglij fol. 383. *Carolstadius first raised his errour.* Melancthon Epist. ad Miconium, calleth it *new doctrine*, and addeth that *Carolstadius first raised the tumult.* Hesshusius lib. de reali præsentia fol. 2: *Carolstadius the vnhappy author of this discord*

Lutherās say that the Sacra. doctrine is new.

cord. Kemnice in fundamentis Cœnæ pag. 186: *Carolstadius was the first author of this strife.* And Hospin. part. 2. Histor. fol. 68. writeth that Melanchon impugned the Sacramentaries doctrine *as a thing altogether new*, and fol. 46. that Pomeran *disallowed Zuinglius doctrine as a nouelti*e. And in Narrat. dissipatæ Eccles. Belg. pag. 179. The Lutherans say to the Caluinists, *your doctrine is new*: and pag. 213. *your doctrine is of late.* And Confes. Mansfeld: *The Sacramentary doctrin is iustly suspected of vs. First for the nouelty therof because it arose in our tyme.* Neither ought the Sacramentaries to accept against these testimonies, as if they were the testimonies of the aduersaries. For such aduersaries they are as themselues account them their brethren in Christ, and members of the same Church. Besides, though themselues be aduersaries both to Catholiks and Lutherans, neuertheless they will haue their testimonies to be take against thē in matters of fact. Moreouer, because the Sacramentaries themselues doe sometime confesse the same. For Zuinglius tom. 2. Respons. ad Struthionem fol. 303. calleth Carolstadius: *The first teather of the truth of the Eucharist.* And in Subsidio fol. 244. he calleth his opinion, *the exposition of the ancients brought back is it were after it was lost.* Lasco Epist. ad Reg. Poloniæ, *Abolished hyniury of times and restored as it were after it was lost.* Lauather de dissidio Euchar. fol. 2. writeth that the Senate of Zurich *VV as troubled which the newnesse of the matter.* And fol. 5. that when Oecolampade had set forth his booke, *the Senate of Basle moued with the nouelty of the matter, forbid his booke to be sold, vntill it had bin examined by Censors.* And fol. 1. that Zuinglius opinio *was not heard of by the common people.* In like sort the Sacramentaries write of the proper opinions of the Lutherans. For of their im-

panation

panation or mixture of Christs body and bread in the Eucharist Caluin Defens. 2. cont. Westphalum pag. 786. sayth: *It is a new doctrine, and till now vnheard of, that bread is substantially the body of Christ.* Oecolampadius responsione poster. ad Perkeymer pag. 18. *Those new Doctours graunt to bread that it is substantially the body of Christ.* And of the Lutherans vbiquity, wherwith they make Christs body to be euery wher, Caluin pronounceth Admonit. vlt. ad Westphalum pag. 829. *that it was not borne long since.* And Alesius apud Hospin part. 2. fol. 201. sayth: *I know both the tyme when this opinion was first broached to the Church, and who was Author thereof.* Authores Admonit. de lib. concord. cap. 3. pag 95. *No man taught this their opinion before Luther. Do they not bring forth new deuises and not heard of before in the Church?* Beza also lib. de Omnipræsentia carnis Christi pag. 509. calleth it *a doctrine vnheard of in the Church.* Finally Clenuitius apud Heshus. lib. vit. calleth the very Confession of Auspurg. *A new and fifth Ghospell.* Thus Protestants testify the ewnesse of each other doctrine.

Sacramentaryes say the Lutheran opinions are new.

9. Eightly I proue the newnesse of Protestancy by the new and before vnheard of names, which protestants giue to themselues, and to their Church and religion. For they call themselues *Protestants, or Ghospellers*: and their Church and Religion *Euangelicall and reformed*. D. Andrewes respons. ad Apol. Bellarm. c. 1. *Protestants is our name.* D. Willet in the Preface of his Synopsis: *VVe refuse not the name of Protestants. This name agreeth fitly to our profession.* Præfat. consensus Poloniæ: *VVe are termed Ghospellers.* Iezler lib. de bello Euchar. fol. 31. *VVe will be called Gospellers; and woe be to them who call vs otherwise.* His maiesty in his declaration against Vorstius pag. 49: *The men of our Religion doe vsuallie take*

The names of Protestants are new.

to

to them the name of Gospellers. D. Morton part. 1. Apol. lib. 1. cap. 7: *If ye aske where is the Euangelicall and reformed Church, all will straight point their finger to the Protestants assemblie.* But surely all these names are new and neuer heard of before Luther, neither can there be any name designed, which before Luthers time was proper to the Protestant company. But it is incredible that there should haue bin such a company, and yet that it neuer had any proper or peculiar name giuen either by those of that company or of any others.

10. Lastly I proue the nouelty of the Protestant Church by that, that Protestants knowing well the newnesse thereof, deny that the greatest antiquity among Christian Churches is a marck of the true Church of Christ, as doth Iunius lib. de Eccles. cap. 16. yea some of them are so offended at this marck of Antiquity, as they bid vs (a) shut our eyes at it, and say that it is a (b) bastardly marke, and rather a mark of the (c) Synagogue of Antichrist, the of the church of Christ. Neuertheles seeing it ought to be vndoubted amongst Christians, that since Christs Church was founded by him, it neuer failed or perished, and that it is manifest, that he founded his true Church before any false Christian in imitation of him began a false Christian Church, it ought also to be certain that she which amongst all Christian Churches is the most ancient, is the very true Church of Christ. Neither would euer Protestants deny this, if they did not too wel know, that their Church is far yonger then the Roman, as being (according to their saying) her daughter.

(a) *Luth. tom. 2. fol. 367.*
(b) *Reinol. Confer. c. 3. diuis. 2.*
(c) *Ples. l. de Eccles. c. 3.*

11. Out of all which hath beene recited in this chapter, I make my eight demonstration in this sort: *If the Protestant Church and Religion were in Luthers*

tyme

tyme new or builded or begun a new, he was the Author and beginner thereof. But for it was, as hath been made manifest by the aforesaid confessions of Protestants. Therefore Luther was the Author thereof.

That Protestants do plainly confesse, that Luther was the Author and Beginner of their Church and Religion.

CHAP. XIIII.

THe ninth demonstration, that Luther was the Author of the Protestant Church and religion, shall be taken out of Protestants open confessions thereof. First therefore they say, that he was the first who openly preached Protestantry. Luther Præfat. in tom. 1: The Dutch men did looke what would be the event of so great a matter, which before none either Bishop or Doctour durst touch. Ibi. fol. 159. It is said, Luther first of all in our age did taxe the Popes abominations, and illustrate the ancient and pure doctrine of the Church. And Præfat. disput. fol. 370. I first allowed the marriage of Bishops. In cap. 3. Galat. tom. 5. fol. 333: Many give God thankes, that by the Ghospell, which by Gods grace we then first of all preached, &c. In cap. 4. fol. 387. God in this later tyme hath againe revealed the tyrath of the Ghospell by us unto the rest of the world. Epist. ad Argentinenses tom. 7. We dare boast, that Christ was first published by us, Melanchthon Præfat. in tom. 3: With what joy did men receave the first sparckle of light discovered by Luther, &c. in tom. 2. Luther: God by him restored the Ghospell to us. Again: He recalled the minds of men to the Fountaine of God, as the Baptist shewed the Lambe that taketh away the sinnes of the world. And præfat. in tom. 3: When there was great darck-

Luther the first that preached his Ghospell.

First published Christ.

First spark of Protestantry.

darkenesse in the Church, and the light of the Ghospell was oppressed, Luther lay open the sufficiency of faith. The vniuersity of VVittemberg in Hospin. part. 2. histor. fol. 230: One of this Church and schools did shine the first light of pure doctrine touching God and Christ, which our new aduersaryes are forced to grant, though they burst with enuy. Amsdorfe, Alber and others write, that Luther was the first vnder heauen, who impugned externall sacrifice & Priesthood in the new testament. Schusselburg lib. 2. Theol. Caluin. fol. 130. sayth that Vtenhouius Caluinissimus impudent, whenhe wrote that he heard Conrad Pellican say, that many learned men in Germany held the doctrine of the ghospell before Luther appeared, and that Pelican himselfe had reiected Purgatory before Luthers name was heard of. This lye (sayth Schusselburg) the later Caluinists haue refuted. And fol. 228. he affirmeth, that Luther began the refuting of the doctrines of the Ghospell. This praise (sayth he) we truly and with good right giue to Luther, though the Caluinists take it in very ill part. Morgenstern tract. 145. sayth, It is ridiculous to thinke that before Luther any held the pure doctrine, and that Luther receiued it of them, and not rather they of him. Milius in explicat. confess. August. art. 17. If Luther had had orthodoxall forerunners in his office, there had beene no need of a Lutheran reformation. The Author of the booke entituled Prognostica or Finis mundi pag. 12. Luther (as is confessed) first brought in the ghospell at the end of the world. Brentius lib. de Cœna in fine. God raised vp Luther to carry before vs the torch of the knowledg of Christ. And Smedensted apud Hospin. part. 2. histor. fol. 232: He first in our age brought into the world the light of the Ghospell, after it had beene extinguished. Thus the Lutherans: And in like manner the Sacramentaryes. Zuinglius resp. ad Luther tom. 2. fol. 380. thus speaketh Luther: Thou first camest into the field. Ibidem in Exegel. fol. 335. We will [illegible] knowledge thee to be the chiefe

The first light.

Had no predecessours.

The first that brought in the Ghospell.

Bishops defender of the Ghospell, the Diuines who first set vpon the Romish Cause, the Champion who durst alone oppose the Campe of the Philistims. Bucer de Cœna pag. 673. calleth Luther our first Apostle of the pure Ghospell, and 673. sayeth, Luther first in our age did impugne superstition. Caluin writeth that he began to take the cause in hand, and first shewed the way. Dunæus lib. de Baptismo cap. 15. Luther first gaue others occasion to thinke rightly of many matters before God. Lauather de disput. Eucharist. anno 1546. Luther first in our age did by diuers writings openly inueigh against Papisticall errors. Author Orthodoxi consensus in Præfat. Apol. Luther and Zuinglius were the first, who began to reprehend inueterate errors. Against: The first teachers of Germany, Luther, Melancthon, &c. Amongst English Protestants M. Iewell in defens. Apol. part. 1. cap. 7. diuis. 3. Thus I say, within later age after yeares of darknesse, Luther was the first that preached the Ghospell of Christ. M. Foxe in his Acts pag. 402. Luther opened the truth long before hidden. M. Wotton in his examination of the title of the Romish Clergy: It might be truly said, that Luther was the first who in that time did publish Christ, especially in the chiefe points of the Ghospell, which is iustification by faith in Christ. And in this respect it is no honour for Luther to haue been a scholler without a father, a scholler without a master. Yea see how plainly they say, that Luther first preached the Ghospell, first brought in the Ghospell, first shewed the way, first published Christ, discouered the first sparkle, first layd open the truths of faith, had no ecclesiasticall Predecessours, was a scholler without a Father, and a scholler without a master, and that in the article of iustification by only faith, which the whole hinges, and foundation of Protestancy.

First shewed the way.

Scholler without a maister.

2. Secondly without Luthers help no man doth know the state of Protestancy. Luther cont. Regem Angliæ tom. 2. fol. 497. Tyndarus had opened the way, they

Nothing at all.

were like to haue vnderstood nothing at all, neither of Christ or of the Ghospell. In cap. 15. 1. Ioh. tom. 5. fol. 134: The ghospell is by our labour and diligence brought into light, and they first learnt it of vs, without our paynes they could neuer haue learnt one word of the Ghospell. And fol. 141: God hath called vs by his holy spirit, that by vs Christ might be manifested & known to the world. This praise they cannot take from vs, that we were the first & carryed away the price of bringing the Ghospell into light of which they would not haue knowne one iote, vnlesse by our paines and study it had beene brought forth. And ibidem in cap. 17. Matth. he saith that without him the Sacramentaries and others would not haue knowne neuer so little of the Euangelicall truth. Zuinglius in Exegesi tom. 2. fol. 358. writeth these wordes of Luther: If they had not had it of vs, doubtlesse they would haue knowne nothing of. And those of Zurich in their confession write thus: Luther boasteth, that himselfe is the Prophet and Apostle of the Germans who hath learnt nothing of any, and all haue learnt of him. None know any thing but what they haue knowne by him.

Not one word.

Not one iote.

Neuer so litle.

3. Thirdly they write, that Luther did kindle the Protestant light. Schusselburg tom. 13. Catal. hæret. pag. 897: By Luthers ministery the cleare light of the ghospell is kindled againe for vs: Lobechius disput. 1. pag. 6. By this mans ministery the Lord hath kindled in Germany the light of the heauenly truth. M. Iewel defens. Apol. part. 1. cap. 7. diuis. 3. pag. 76. Luther and Zuinglius were appointed of God to kindle againe the light which you had quenched. Verheiden in his Images, at the Image of Luther: Thou first didst preach the Ghospell with so great constancy. Thou didst lighten the torch of the ghospell to the world. And at the Image of Zuinglius he saith of him and Luther: These two Architects layeing the foundation of the Euangelicall kingdome. D. Whitaker cont. 4. quæst. 5. cap. 3. pag. 693. Luther lighted a torch which no floods can put out. And in

Luther kindled the Protestant light.

Laid the foundation.

Præfat. tom. 2. Danæi, is falsified: God raised up Luther for to kindle and restore to the world the light of his Gospel. And what is it to be a kindler of light, but to be Author thereof.

4. Fourthly they say, that Luther was the renewer, the Founder, the Restorer, the setter and promulgator of their Church and Religion. Zuinglius in Exegesi tom. 2. fol. 358. writeth, that Luther challengeth to himself all the instauration of 1518. Illyricus in Schusselburg. tom. 13. Catal. hæret. fol. 850: The same religion was renewed and sealed by Luther. Hamburgenses ibidem fol. 668. Luther truly the renewer of divine worship. Hesshusius lib. de præsentia Christi sayth of Luther: He was that notable instrument by which true religion was renewed. Saxonici in the conference at Aldburg Scripto 7. pag. 319. speake thus: Since the time of the Ghospel renewed by Luther. Hemingius in Schusselburg. lib. 2. Theol. Calum. Pap. 133. Luther restored the ancient worship which our first parents received of God, and which Christ commended to his Church. Calvin admonit. 2. pag. 1471 By his endeavour principally the purity of the Ghospel was restored: And pag. 768. God raysed Luther & others, by whose ministery our Churches were founded and inflamed. The Protestant Princes in Germany in Schusselburg tom. 13. catal. pag. 877. write that the King of Navarre willingly affirmeth the French Churches to acknowledge Luther to be their Father in Christ. Or as Thuanus lib. 29. histor. reporteth their wordes: That Luther is esteemed and honoured of the French Churches as their Father in Christ, and that by his ministry truth was first called out. Beza de Hæres. puniend. pag. 141. Luther the Restorer of Christian Religion. And in his Images: The principall instrument of Christianity renewed in Germany. Dædem cont. 5. pag. 1133. reckoneth Luther among those, of whom (saith he) all other men have received

Renewed religion & sealed by

Restored purity of the Ghospel.

Renewed religion.

what light of the Ghospell they haue. And lib. 1. de Euchar. cap. 1. termeth him *the Renewer of the Ghospell of Christ*. And Apol. pro Eccles. Heluet: *The first renewer of the Church*. Hospin. part. 2. hist. fol. 134: *The first renewer of Euangelicall truth and doctrine*. Bucer Resp. ad Episc. Abrincen. pag. 613. writeth *that God by Luther hath meruailously and happily restored the summe of the Ghospell in our age*. D. Whitaker cont. 2. quest. 5. cap. 12. pag. 528: *Luther only tooke vpon him to restore religion corrupted, and to renew the ancient and true doctrine*. And ad Rat. 10. Campiani calleth him *the Renewer of the old faith*; or as the English Apology termeth him *the promulgater of this doctrine*. D. Humphrey in Prolegomenis pag. 82 saith: *We reuerence Luther as a great renewer of Religion*. And what is it to be a renewer, Restorer, Setter of a thing corrupted, especially if he restore the summe thereof, as Bucer sayd that Luther restored the summe of Religion, but to be an Author or maker of it according to the very substance thereof.

First Renewer of the Church & truth.

Restored the summ of the Ghospell. Restored Religion.

5. Finally, they plainly graunt, that Luther was the first to whom Protestancy was reuealed, that he layd the first foundation of Protestant Religion, and that he was the captaine, Author, and Begetter thereof. Luther himselfe in sermone, *Quid sit hominis Christiane præstandum* tom. 7. fol. 274. speaketh thus to Protestants: *I was the first whome God set in these tiſts. I was also the first, to whome God vouchsafed to reueale these thinges which are now preached vnto you*. Behould Christian Reader a new (a) Aetius surnamed Atheist, who sayd, *that these thinges were now reueled to him by God, which hitherto he would haue to be hidden vnto all*. A new (b) Eunomius, who sayd, that he *had found a new way to God and vnheard of which none before had perceaued*. A new (c) Nestorius, who gloried that *he first vnderstood the Scriptures*. A new

Luther first to whome Protestants was reuealed.

(a) *Theod. l. 2. c. 18.*

(b) *Basil. l. cont. Eun.*

(c) *Vinc. l. 1.*

Cata-

Cataphryge, (d) we haue sayd: *We haue the first translation & of vs beginneth the Christian sayth.* For of thee (Luther) began the Protestant sayth, and thou were the first, to whom the God of this world (as the Apostle speaketh) vouchsafed to reuealeale those thinges which haue beene preached to Protestants: *To thee alone* (that I may vse Tertullians wordes) *hath truth been reuealed. For seeth thou hast found greater fauour and more plentifull grace at the Diuells hands.* Againe in expost. Papaselli tom. 2. fol. 398. Luther hath these words: *When I layd the first foundation of this cause*, as Bullinger Præfat. Comment. in Ioan. writeth of Zuinglius saying: *When Zuinglius layd the first foundation of Euangelicall doctrine.* Moreouer Luther tom. 1. fol. 396. writeth thus to his most inward fellow Melanchon: *The citty is full of the rumor of my name, and all men desire to see the man the Herostratus of so great a fire.* Ye see, how in a letter to his most assured friend, he confesseth himselfe to be the Herostratus, that is, the Author of that fire wherewith not the temple of Diana, but the temple of God burneth. Melanchon also acknowledged the like, as it appeareth by these wordes of Luther in a letter to him tom. 9. Wittemberg. Germ. fol. 416. *Thou writest, that for my authorityes sake thou didst follow me as the author, and leader or captaine in this matter*, Behould how Melanchon accounted Luther the Author. And what suspicion is there, that Melanchon should in this matter write otherwise to him then he thought. Schusselburg tom. 8. Catal. pag. 363. defineth true Lutherans or Protestants to be those, *who imbrace the doctrin of the Gospell reiecting Papish abuses, of which amendement* (sayth he) *Luther was the Author.* And the same meane they, who call Luther the Author of the Protestant reformation. For they protest amendment or reformation is

(d) Aduers. de Synod. Præscrip. cap. 34.

Laid the first foundation of Protestacy.

An Herostratus.

Author & leader.

indeed (as hath beene shewed before) a substantiall mutation or change of religion, and therefore the Authour of such an amendment or reformation is indeed the Author of a new Church and religion. D. Sutcline lib. 2. de Eccles. cap. 3. pag. 237. writeth in this manner: *Who were the first Authors of raysing the Church fallen downe, as Cranmer, and other our Bishops, also Luther, Zuinglius &c.* And cap. 7. pag. 328. *The Princes who first followed the Authours of restoring religion.* Osiander in Sleidan fol. 22. sayd that Luther & Melanchon *had made a certaine divinity which savoured more the flesh then the spirit.* Lobechius disput. 1. pag. 26. calleth Luther *the first deviser of the Confession of Ausburg.* And Melchior Neosanius Pastour of the Church of Brunswich in loc. Kemnitij part. 2. sayth: *How much doth all Duch-land owe to worthy Luther for his great deserts, who was the Author of pure Religion.* D. Couel also in his defens. of Hooker art. 19. pag. 130. plainely confesseth, that *some Protestants make Luther and Calvin Authours of the religion which they hold.* And M. Horne in his harbour maketh England speake in this manner: *I am thy Country England, which brought forth blessed man Iohn Wiclise, who begot Hus, who begot Luther, who begot truth.* And hereupon it ariseth, that (as Reiscius in his Miniſtromachia p. 15. reporteth) the Lutherans call Islebium (where Luther was borne) their new Bethleem. Forsooth because there was borne their new Messias, the begetter Author, and founder of their religion. Mark now Reader how Luther, by his owne and other Protestants confession was, *the first to whome Protestant doctrine was revealed, layd the first foundation of the Protestant Confession, was the Authour of the Protestant amendment or reformation, was the deviser of the first Protestant Confession, was the Heresiarcha of the Protestant sect, finally was the leader, worker, begetter,*

Author. Maker. Deviser. Authour. Begetter. A new Bethleem.

and

and Author of the Protestant Church, and Religion. Which is in plaine termes the very same which in all this booke I endeauour to proue. Iustly therefore may Protestants sing to Luther as Lucretius did to his Epicure the Author & beginner of Epicurisme. Those also of Basle were not ashamed in the Epitaph of his tombe to call Oecolampadius, *the first author of Euangelicall doctrine in that city*, as report Hospin. and Lauather in their Hostorie an. 1531. and Iunius lib. 4. de Eccles. cap. 8. Neither was it peculiar to Luther to spread deuises vnder the name of religiō. For thus writeth Iezler. de bello Euchar. fol. 26. of Ministers: *Matters deuised of some few, we thrust vpon the whole world.* And King Henry 8. when he began to encline to Protestancie, set forth articles with this title, *Articles deuised of his Maiesty.* Lib. 3.

6. And from this euidēce & acknowledgement that Luther was the Author of Protestant religion, it proceedeth. First, that Luther oftentimes calleth it *his doctrine, his gospell, his word, his cause, his part.* For so he speaketh tom. 1. fol. 138. tom. 2. fol. 23. 39. 93. 238. 488. 493. 494. tom. 3. fol. 556 tom. 5. fol. 290. tom. 6. fol. 79. and other where often. Secondly it ariseth that true Protestancie is called *Lutheran doctrine, the Lutheran cause, the Lutheran religion, the Lutheran holinesse, and Lutheranisme.* Of Luther himselfe tom. 2. fol. 37. and 497. Of Frederick the Electour tom. 1 Lutheri fol. 237. Of his Counsailers tom. 2. fol. 116. Of the deuines of Mansfeld in Schusselburg tom. 8. pag. 270. Of Schusselburg himselfe Epist. dedicat. tom. 4. Of Melancthon tom. 2. Lutheri fol. 193. 197. Of Kemnice Epist. dedicat. lib. de duabus naturis. Of Hutter in Analysi Confess. August. pag. 595. Of Brunsfelse Respons. ad

Protestancy is Luthers doctrine.

Protestāts terme themselues Lutherās,

Spongiam Erasmi. Of Lobechius in Epist. dedicat. Disput. Of George Fabritius l. b. 1 & 8. Orig. Saxon. and of other Lutherans. And in like maner of Sacramentaries also, as of Bucer in Matth. 26. & lib. de Cura animorum pag. 261. Of Hospin. Prefat. part. 2 Histor. Of Scultete Con. secular. Of D. Merton 11 part. Apol. lib. 1. cap. 45. and others Thirdly therof proceedeth, that the true and proper Protestants are called Lutherans, both of themselues and of others. For thus speaketh Luther in psalm. 118. tom. 7. fol. 551: *I graunt my selfe to be a Lutheran*. And in like manner speaketh he ibidem fol. 79. 242. 233. 361. & 400. And tom. 2. fol. 473. and in Hospin. part. 2. fol. 194. So also speaketh Melancthon in dominicam 8. Trinit. tom. 1. and in Hospin. lib. cit. fol. 72. and Brentius also ibid. fol. 107. So speaketh the Confession of Saxonie in the Preface, and the Saxon Ministers in the Conference of Aldburg pag. 160. Vrban. Regius in Indicio de Conuentu Norimberg pag. 9. Amsdorfe in Bucer in Scriptis Anglicis p. 635. Matheus Iudex in Edicto eterni Dei. Iames Andrewes in Colloq. Montisbel. pag. 179. Pet. Graner in the Preface of his Caluinisticall absurdities dedicateth his booke *Vnto the proper Lutherans*: and pag. 61. affirmeth, that their men are called Lutherans, that they may be distinguished from Papists and Caluinists. Scusselburg tom. 17. Catal. pag. 366. sayth, *The Diuines of our part call themselues, and the Defenders of their opinion, Lutherans*. Which also affirmeth Reinecius tom. 1. Armat. cap. vlt. Hutten in Expostulat cum Erasm. sayth: *I acknowledge the name of Lutheran*. And Hailbruner: *We are not ashamed of the name*. And Andrew Schafman in Prodromo bringeth many reasons to proue, that they did well

in

in calling themselues Lutherans. And those of Berge (as Hospin reporteth in Concord. Discord. c. 20.) say that, *All the sincere doctours of the Church call themselues Lutherans of Luther.* The same also testifie the Sacramentaries. For those of Newstade against the bookes of Concord. cap. 6. pag. 212. say *they account none a sincere disciple of Christ, vnlesse he will be called as well a Lutheran as a Christian.* The author of the orthodoxe Consent in Præfat. Apologet. *They take to themselues factious names vpon a preposterous and too great esteeme of their maister.* Paræus in cap. 2. Galat. lect. 24. *They desire not only to call themselues Lutherans of Luther, but also will be so called of all.* Beza in Conspicil. pag. 8. *To all will be named and called Lutherans.* And pag. 56. *Not content with the name of Christians, they call themselues Lutherans, and require to be so called.* Danæus Apol. cont. Iac. Andreæ saith that, *He glorieth in Luther as in an other Christ, of whome euery where he thundereth, & calleth himself a Lutheran, a Lutheran &c.* And Resp. ad Selnecer he saith, that Selnecer *Freely confesseth, that the Dutch Churches terme themselues Lutherans.* Vrsin in Catechism. pag. 494. saith: *This is the opinion of them who call themselues Lutherans.* Zanchius Epist. dedicat. Miscellan. *Many are not ashamed to write printed bookes to all themselues Lutherans.* And Iezlet de bello Enchus. fol. 112. *Some haue no shame euen in pulpits to say: We will be Lutherans constantly.* And at some times euen the sacramentaries seeme to be desirous of the surname of Lutherans. For those of Newstade in Admonit. de lib. Concordiæ pag. 196. complaine, that *some would seeme to be the only disciples of Luther.* Musculus in locis tit. de hæresi pag. 604. saith: *No man condemneth true Lutherans, vnlesse he be ignorant of the truth or vtterly naughty.* And the Protestant Princes of Germanie in Thuan. lib. 79. Histor. pag. 595. relate, that the King of Navarre

wrote

wrote to them, that if the French Protestants, were to be termed of any man; they ought most of all to be called Lutherans. Because when this name was odious in France for almost threescore years, many by fire, but ask, be death sealed with their blood the testimonie of that doctrin which they received first of Luther. Scultete also in Concione sæculari cõpareth Luther with the Apostolicall men. Besides the Sacramentaries call Luthers true followers Lutherãs, as Zuinglius tom. 1. fol. 420. 436. 470. Oecolampadius ibidem fol. 479. and in Hospin part. 2. fol. 84. 112. 226. Tigurini ibidem fol 88. Bucer in cap Rom. & in Scriptis Angl. pag. 669. Martyr tom. 2. loc. Epist. ad Caluin. Hospin. lib. cit. fol. 91. Caluin in Zancius lib. 2. Epist. pag. 78. Danæus ibidem pag. 401. Zanchius himselfe pag. 394. Pareus lib. 5. de Amiss. grat. cap. 1. & 2. lib 4. cap. 17 lib. 6 cap. 1. Vorstius in Antibellarm. pag. 561. D. Whitaker cont. 1. quæst. 2. cap. 3. and quæst. 5. c. 8. and quæst. 6. cap. 9. cont. 4. quæst. 5. cap. 3. & lib. 3. de Concupisc. cap. 9. & lib. 3. de Scrip. cap. 2 sect. 3. D. Fulke de Success. pag. 321. M. Perkins in Explicat. Symboly col. 781. & 790. Yea Iezler loc. cit. fol. 39. & Vorstius in Collat. cum Piscatore write, *that properly and vulgarly they are called Lutherãi.* Wherupon D. Humfrey ad Rat. 2. Campian. pag. 128. sayth, *Lutherans vulgarly called.*

7. Hereby we see, first that the Lutherans glory of the name of Luther, as the Donatists (which S. Augustin reporteth) did of the name of Donatus. Secondly, that they glory of a schismaticall name: for such is the name of Lutherans, as Luther himselfe confesseth in D. Morton part. 2. Apol. lib. 1. cap. 8. And Hospin Præfat. part. 2. Histor. Vorstius in Antibellarm. pag. 149 Yea D. Whitaker cont. 3. quæst.

3. quest. 5. cap. 2. sayth, that to take the name of any man at all, is Heretical and schismatical, and that heretikes carry the names of their maisters, and willingly acknowledge such names. Thirdly it appeareth, that the English Apologie vntruly sayd, that Luthers disciples are called Lutherans in disgrace or derision. For Grauer lib. cit. sayth, they are termed so *for distinctions sake*. Lauatherus and Hospin. Præfat. Histor. say, they call them so *for doctrines sake, that it may be knowne whome they meãs*. And Scul ete so termeth them for honours sake. And surely sith both Sacramentaries, the common people, and themselues also terme them Lutherans, and glory also in that name, it cannot be sayd, that they are called so in disgrace or contemp. Fourthly it appeareth to be false, that D. Morton lib. cit. and D. Sutline lib. de Eccles. cap. 2. say: *It is rather to be attributed to a lye then to Luthers desert, that Protestants call themselues Lutherans*. For (as we see) Luther himselfe called them so, and therin they follow his example. Neither skilleth it, that Luther did once dislike this name, because he did oftentimes vse it, & it was vsuall to Luther to allow and disallow the same thing. Fiftly we see it to be false, which D. Whitaker writeth cont. 2 quest. 5. cap. 2 pag. 494: *None of vs euer called himselfe a Lutheran: we acknowledge not these names, nor are we delighted with them. This name our aduersaries haue fastened vpon vs, only vpon malice and enuie: Neither are we called Lutherans but of the Papists*. False also is that, which D. Fulke sayth de Succes. pag. 288. that *they acknowledge no other name proper to their religion, but the name of Christians and Catholiques*. These I say are false; for Luther (whome D. Whitaker accounteth his father) and the Lutherans (whome he termeth his brethren in Christ) doe call themselues so, and are well

well pleased with that name. Besides, they are so termed of the Sacramentaries and common people, and therfore not of Papists only, not vpon malice and enuie, but (as Grauer sayd) truly for distinction sake, and that most iustly. For as S. Athanase sayth, *Who deriue the origen of their faith from other then Christ, iustly carry the surnames of their Authors.* But Protestants (as we haue shewed) confesse that they deriue the origen of their faith from Luther. Therfore iustly they beare his name.

8. Out of all which hath bin rehearsed in this chapter, I thus frame my ninth demonstration of this Matter: *If Luther and many other famous Protestants sometimes indeed, some times in plaine words do confesse, that Luther was the Author of their Church and religion, he ought to be so taken and esteemed. But they do so confesse. Ergo.* The Minor is euident by all that is sayd in this Chapter: And the Maior, by what we sayd in the Preface. For so many and such principall Protestants knew well the origen of their religion, and willingly would not lye to the disgrace and ouerthrow therof.

That Protestants cannot proue their Church to haue bin before Luthers time, by any probable argument or sufficient testimonie.

CHAP. XV.

THe tenth and last demonstration for to proue that Luther was the first Author of the Protestants Church and religiō I will take from hence, that albeit Protestants doe sometimes boldly affirme their Church and religiō to haue bin before Luthers time

time, Yet they can neuer proue it by any reasonable argument or sufficient testimony. Which thing alone woulde suffice to shew, that (as I sayd before) it is a fable vainely feigned, falsely affirmed, and fondly beleiued. It hath bin alwayes the fashion of heretiques boldly to auouch any thing, but few things to proue euen in shew. This S. Augustin doth often obserue in the Manichees and Donatists, and some of his sayings we haue alleadged before. Of Eunomius S. (a) Basil noteth the same, and S. (b) Ambrose of all heretikes saying, *Heretiques are wolues, they can howle, but proue nothing.* And this doe Protestants confesse. For thus D. Whitaker cont. 2 quæst. 5. cap 18: *Heretikes are wont to boast and promise truth, but not to proue it.* Of Luther thus writeth Zuinglius tom. 2. fol. 473. and 509: *One argument he hath in all these matters, He sayd it.* And fol. 447: *Luther relyeth only vpon his toyes and deuises.* Fol. 395: *Thou putteſt forth what soeuer the motion of thy affections do appoint, and when a reason of thy saying is exacted of thee, thou standest naked, vnarmed.* And of the Lutherans thus writeth Erasmus: *They say it, and for that alone they will be beliued.* Of the Sacramentaryes in like manner Luther writeth in defens. verb. Cœnæ tom. 7. fol. 384. *One word not easily ouerturneth all these thinges: for if you deny them, then as butter melteth in the sun so they quaile.* And the same is euident to all that read the bookes either of Lutherans or Sacramentaryes. In the meane tyme they cry to vs, that that Pythagoricall word: *He sayd it*, hath no other place but in (e) Christ and the Scriptures: that in other it is the proper argument of (d) fooles: that to affirme any thing beside scripture, is to (e) trifle: that til we proue our affirmatiue, they will stand in their (f) negatiue, and exact (g) demonstrations, that is, either expresse

(a) *Lib. 2. cont. Eunom.*

(b) *Serm. 6. in psal. 118.*

In Distrib.

(c) *Vvhit lib. 2. de script. cap. 10. sect. 5. Bullenger in comp. l. 2. c. 3.*

(d) *Vorstius Antibol. p. 402.*

(e) *Powel. Laude Antic. c. 19.*

(f) *Luth. tom. 2. fol. 417.*

(g) *Vorstius l. cit. Fulke de succeſſ. p.*

proffe testimonies of scripture, or forcible reason deduced from thence. Now we say the same to them. They affirme their Church to haue bin before Luthers time. We deny it vntil they prove it. Neither let them affirme it only, which is the proofe of fooles & wilfull men, but if they cannot bring demonstrations therof, at least let them produce some credible testimonie, or some effectuall reason and argument. Otherwise their beliefe in this matter, is (as sayth Tertullian) *a perverse beliefe which will not believe thinges proued, and believeth thinges which cannot be proued.* Scorp. c. 11.

2. That in this matter they be destitute of all credible testimonie, appeareth sufficently by what hath heretofore bin rehearsed of their owne confessions, and now we will shew, that they want also all probable reason or argument. For all their arguments herein be reduced to this one: *Our doctrine is the doctrine of Christ: Therfore our Church was alwayes since Christ.* For thus agreeth D. Whitaker cont. 2. q. 5. c. 3. p. 498: *Vse this argument: What Church soeuer keepeth the doctrine & preaching of the Apostls, she is the Apostolical Church. But our Church doth so, Therefore &c. Of the Maior* (sayth he) *no controuersy can be made.* And cap. 5. p. 505: *It was our Church which was in the tymes of the Apostles and afterward vnto the Apostasie. But how doe we prove this? By this reason, that our Church keepeth the same faith and doctrine which the Church in the Apostles time and afterward kept.* And cont. Duteum sect. 1: *If thou holdest Christs doctrine thou art a Catholike.* And sect. 2: *It must needs be the true Church of Christ which keepeth & conserueth Christs doctrine delinered in his word.* Dancus cont. 3. pag. 388. *With vs is the true Church of God, because we restore the true doctrine of Christ.* Lubbertus lib. 5 de Eccles cap. 1: *If the doctrine which our Church professeth, be the same which Christ deliuered, then*

our

our Church is that which Christ instituted. D. Fulke lib. de Succeſſ. pag. 27: *Seeing we are ready to proue out of the ſcripture, that we profeſſe the ſame doctrine of fayth, and manners, which Christ would haue to be perpetuall by euident reaſon, our ſucceſſion is manifeſt, although all Hiſtaryes were ſilent of the names of the Perſons and continuation of ſucceſſion*. And the like he hath pag. 154. and 331. D. White in his way pag. 403. ſayth he knoweth his Church was alwayes, becauſe it holdeth the fayth of the Scripture, which cannot be extinguiſhed. The like he ſayth pag. 320. & 326. Likewiſe Luther de notis Eccleſ. tom. 7. fol. 149. Caluin in Matth. cap. 24. verſ. 28. and generally al of them whiles they make the truth of doctrin the infallible marke of the Church. *O proofe* (that I may cry out in S. Auguſtins words) *O errour, o dotage*. And with S. Athanaſe: *A worthy hereſy which wanteth probable reaſons to vnderproppe it*. For this argument on which all their belief, that their Church was before Luther doth rely, is a moſt fond ſophiſme, and moſt counterfait ſyllogiſme, as manifeſtly appeareth, whether it be framed in that forme wherein D. Whitaker hath propoſed it, or whether it be reduced to this forme: *That Church which holdeth the true doctrine of Chriſt hath alwayes beene, and conſequently before Luther. The Proteſtant Church holdeth the true doctrin, holdeth the true doctrin of Chriſt as* (ſay they) *we will proue by ſcripture. Therefore it hath bin alway*. *Lib. 2. contra Arian.*

3. I anſwere that this argument is a manifeſt ſophime for many cauſes. For if the Maior be particuler, ſo that the ſenſe thereof be, *Some Church which holdeth the true doctrine of Chriſt hath alwayes beene*, it is true becauſe the catholik church, which holdeth Chriſts true doctrine, hath alwayes been: but then the Syllogiſme is ſophiſm for want of due forme, infer-ing a con-

a conclusion out of particular propositiõ. But if the Maior be vniuersall, according as it is made of D. Whitaker, then so farre is it from being out of controuersy (as he affirmeth) that it is manifestly false, and no way true, but only apparant, and therefore vnfit to make a true syllogisme, but only a counterfait and a sophisme. That it is manifestly false, is euident, because that Church or company of Christiãs which is strictly and properly termed schismatical, holdeth the true doctrine of Christ as both the Fathers teach, and the Protestants themselues doe also most plainely affirme, & yet it is not the true church of Christ. Wherefore sith (as the Philosopher teacheth) those thinges are probable, which seem true to all, or to most, or to wise men, and those either al, or most, or most approued, and such as are not probable serue only to make sophismes; The foresayd Maior, not seeming true to all, or most, or the wisest Christians, yea not euen to the Protestants themselues, it is manifest, that it is no probable propositiõ, but only apparent, and therefore not fit to make a true syllogisme, but only an apparent and counterfait.

Protestãts assume a manifest falsity.

4. That the Fathers teach that a Schismatical Church holdeth the true doctrine of Christ, is manifest by S. Augustine who lib. quest. Euang. pag. 38. tom. 4. sayth: *It vseth to be enquired, wherein Schismatickes differ from heretickes, and this found; that no difference in sayght but breach of society in communion maketh Schismatikes.* And lib. de fide & Symbolo cap. 10: *Heretikes by believing wrong of God violate the sayth: but Schismatikes by wicked diuisions leape from fraternall charity, albeit they believe aright those thinges which we believe.* And lib. cont. Gaud. cap. 9. refuteth him, because he had layd, that Schismatikes

That Schismatikes hold true doctrine.

matikes and Heretikes are the same; against which he sayth: *Thou art a Schismatike by sacrilegious diuision, and an heretike by sacrilegious opinion.* And lib. 1. cont. Cresc. cap. 29. and de gestis cum Emerito affirmeth that the same sayth is had out of the Church. S. Hierome in Tit. 3. *We iudge this difference to be betweene heresy and schisme that heresy holdeth a naughty opinion, schisme separateth from the Church by dissention of Bishops.* S. Gregory lib. 18. Moral. cap. 14. *Some doe believe false things of God, others by Gods help believe rightly of God, but keep not vnity with their brethren, these are diuided by schisme.* S. Isidor. lib. 8. Origin cap 3. *Schisme tooke its name of breach, for it beleeueth the same religion and rites that others do, only is pleased to keep company a part.* The same teach S. Ireneus lib. 4. cap. 62. S. Chrysost. hom. 3. in 1. Cor. S. Optat. lib. 1. 4. & 5. cont. Parmen. and others. And it is manifest by reason. For if Schismatikes did erre also in Fayth, they should not differ from heretikes. And it is graunted both of old and new Heretikes. For thus sayth Faustus in S. Augustine lib. 20. cont. Faustum cap. 3. *Schisme if I be not deceaued, is to believe the same & to worship God in the same manner that others do, only to be delighted with diuision of assemblyes.* Caluin 4. Institut. cap. 2. §. 5. *Austin putteth this difference betwixt heretikes and schismatikes, that they corrupt the sincerity of the fayth with false doctrines, these sometymes euen hauing the like fayth breake asunder the band of society.* And in. 1. Cor. cap. 11. vers. 19. *It is known in what sense the ancient vsed both these names (schisme heresy,) they put heresy in difference of doctrine, but schisme rather in alienation of mindes, to wit, when any either vpon enuy, or hatred of the Pastours or of frowardnesse departed from the Church.* Beza libro de punicndis Hæreticis pag. 89: *Schism properly is the diuision of those who believe the same things* And pag. 150. *Let them remember that we terme them not*

heretikes, who are properly called Schiſmatiques. The ſame he hath in 1. Cor. 1. v. 10. and otherwhere. Plesſis lib. de Eccleſ. cap. 1. pag. 16: *We call erroneous Churches either heretikes, or ſchiſmatikes according as they erre either in fayth or in charity.* And pag. 32. *What pertaineth to ſchiſmaticall Churches, either they are ſimply ſchiſmaticall or when hereſy alſo is adioyned as it vſeth after ſchiſme, as an ague after a wound.* And cap. 10. pag. 340. *True and pure Schiſmatiks are thoſe, who holding the ſame doctrine yet make meetinges a part.* Peter Martyr in locis tit. de Schiſm. pag. 618. *I thinke it more plaine to define Schiſme to be a cutting a ſunder of the Eccleſiaſticall peace & vnity.* And pag. 619: *There may be ſchiſme in the Church without hereſy.* Aretius alſo in locis part. 2. fol. 10: *Schiſme ſometymes in the ſame doctrin breaketh ſociety.* Bucan in loc. queſt. 33. de Eccl. affirmeth, that ſchiſmatiks differ from heretiks becauſe *hereſy properly is diſſention in doctrine.* Polan. part. 2. Theſ. de notis Eccl. *Albeit ſchiſmatical Churches agree in the doctrine of truth &c.* Zanchius tract. de Eccleſ. cap.: *There may be breach in the ſymboles of Charity, that is in participation of Sacraments communication of publike prayer, and ſuch like other Eccleſiaſticall exercises, to wit when one thought be agree with the reſt of the Church of Chriſt in the principall heades of Chriſtian fayth, yet I know not for what light cauſes withdraweth himſelfe from the reſt of the Church and communicateth not with her in the ſacraments.* Such (ſayth he) *are properly called ſchiſmatikes.* M. Perkins in cap. 5. Galat. verſ. 21. *Hereſy is in doctrin, Schiſme in manners, order, and gouernement.* D. Fulke de Succeſſ. pag. 165: *There may be ſchiſme in the Church, where the ſame doctrine is held on both partyes, & the one wanteth lawfull ſucceſſion.* D. Field lib. 1. of the Church cap. 7: *Some profeſſe the whole ſauing fayth but not in vnity, as ſchiſmatiks.* Daneus in Auguſt. de hæreſ. cap. 3. *He is a ſchiſmatike, who retayning the ſame doctrine of fayth and that entire, yet*

without

without probable and better reason followeth not the decent rites of the Church. The same he hath Apol. pro Heluet. Eccles. pag. 1485. Bullinger tom. 1. Decad. 5. serm. 2. Vorstius in Antibellarm. pag. 190. D. Whitaker cont. 2. quest. 5. cap. 10. D. Rainolds Prælect. 1. col. 2. Hemingius in 1. Cor. 1. and others.

5. Now that proper Schismatikes, to wit, such as willfully separate themselues from the Communion of the Church, be not members or parts of the Church, is cleare by the testimony of the Fathers, the confessions of Protestants, and manifest reason. S. Augustin lib. de fide & symbolo cap. 10. sayth: *Neither doth an heretike belong to the Catholike Church, nor a schismatike*. Tract. 3. in 1. Ioan. *All heretikes, all schismatikes are gone out of the Church*. Lib. 3. de Baptism. cap. 19. *All heretikes and schismatikes are false Christians*. And lib 2. cont. Cresc. cap. 29: *I thinke not that any so doteth to beleeue him to belong to the vnity of the Church, who hath not charity*. The like he hath in many places S. Ambrose lib. 7. in Luc. cap. 11. *Vnderstand that all heretikes and schismatikes are separated from the kingdome of God and from the Church*. S. Optatus lib. 2. *The Church cannot be with any heretikes or schismatikes*. S. Fulgentius de fide ad Petrum cap. 38: *Beleeue most stedfastly and doubt nothing, that not only all Pagans, but also all Iewes, Heretiks, & schismatiks, which end this life out of the church, are to go into euerlasting fire* The same teach S. Hierome, & S. Chrysostome loc. cit. S. Ignatius Epist. ad Smyrnens. S. Iren. lib. 4. cap. 62. S. Cyprian lib. de vnit. & epist. 42. 51. 55. S. Prosper de vocat. Gentium cap. 4. and the rest. The protestants confessions of this matter we related heeretofore, amongst whome lay, that this is an vndoubted truth. Reason also conuinceth the same: for as Caluin confesseth 4. Institut. loc. cit. The cõ-

That Schismatikes are out of the Church.

Lib. 1. c. 1 num. 4.

munion of the Church is held with two bandes, to wit consent of doctrine and fraternall charity: But Schismatikes breake the band of fraternall charity: therefore they are not within the Church. Againe Dangæus lib. 3. de Eccl. c. 5. sayth: This is the marke that thou art of the visible Church, that outwardly thou professe the fayth & communicate with the rest of the Church in the same Sacrements: but schismatikes doe not communicate in Sacramentes with the rest of the Church. And D. Feild lib. 2. of the Church cap. 2. sayth: Communion in Sacramentes vnder lawful Pastours is an essential note of the true Catholike Church: but Shismatiks want this communion. And Casaubon epist. ad Card. Peron. pag. 9. *The true Churches of Christ are vnited in the vnity of sayth, and doctrine, and coniunction of minds and in true charity and offices of charity, especially of mutuall prayer.* But Schismatikes are not vnited in charity and offices of mutuall prayer. Finally only Catholikes are members of the Catholike Church, as is euident and (a) Protestants confesse: But Schismatikes are not Catholiks, as the very name doth declare, the Fathers doe teach, and (b) Protestants acknowledge.

(a) *Vvhi. cont. 2. q. 5. cap. 3.*
(b) *Gesner loc. 24. Field l. de Eccles. c. 7.*

6. By this it appeareth that the foresayd Maior which is the foundation of Protestants in this matter, is not only false, but also so manifestly false, as out of this question, it is commonly denyed of Protestants themselues. Besides it is not only false, but also so improbable, that neither it is proued of Protestants, nor can be any other wayes, then by proofe of fooles or willfull men, that is, by their owne saying. For D. Whitaker (as we haue seene) proueth it no other wayes, then by saying, it is out of controuersy. D. Fulke, that it is manifest. But Luther

more

more boaſtingly ſayth I. de Miſſe priu. tom. 7. f. 247. *Thus is our ſolid foundation and moſt ſtedfaſt rocke: Wherſoeuer true doctrine of Chriſt or the Ghoſpell is preached, there is neceſſarily the true holy Church of God. And who doubteth of this* (ſayth he) *may in like manner doubt, whether the Ghoſpel be the word of God.* A notable proofe ſurely, and fit for Pythagoras ſchoole, and a ſound foundation, on which ſo fayned a Church ſhould rely, and a fit rock for them to build vpon, who haue left the rocke vpon which Chriſt built his Church. Wherefore that I may imitate S. Auguſtine in the like matter. I aske whether God or man hath told them, that whereſoeuer true doctrine is, there is the true Church? If God, let them read it out of the Scripture, where indeed we read, that where the true Church is, there true doctrine is: but contrary wiſe, that where true doctrine is, there the true Church is, there we neuer read. If men haue told you this: Behold a fiction of man, behold what you beliefue, behold what ye ſerue, behold for what ye rebell, ye run mad, ye burne. Againe, what kind of men were they, ſurely no other then your ſelues. And what is your authority, I ſay not with vs, but euen with your ſelues? Is (as one of your partſayd) *the iudgement of Lutherans or Sacramentaryes, the ſquare of truth?* Moreouer, ſeeing that three things are eſſential or ſubſtantial to the true church, to wit, true doctrine, lawfull Paſtours, and people following their Paſtours, nor any thing can be, vnleſs all the eſſentiall parts be, it is ſophiſtry and madneſſe to inferre, that that company is the true Church wherin one only of theſe parts is to be found. If they ſay, that by the true Church they meane not her which is true in nature, or eſſence of the Church, but only her which is true in doctrine, of whoſe eſſence

Lib. 1. cont. Gaudent. cap. 33.

Parens l 3. de iuſtific. cap. 18.

is only truth of doctrin. First they deceaue the Reader. For we speak only of the Church true in essence, not of that which is only true in doctrin, as a schismaticall Church may be. Besides, if they meane such a true Church and vnderstand their foresayd Maior vniuersally, it is false; for not euery true Church in that sense is Apostolicall or hath euer beene. For a schismaticall Church is true in doctrine, and yet is neither Apostolicall, nor hath euer beene. And if they vnderstand their Maior particularly the conclusion followeth not, because it is deduced out of pure particuler propositions. And thus much of the Maior.

Protestats proofe out of a thing more vnknowne.

7. Secondly the foresayd argument is a sophism because of the Minor, by which one vnknown thing is proued by another, one false thing by another, not only false, but also impossible. For it is more vncertaine, that the Protestant Church holdeth the doctrin of Christ, then that she was before Luther. For albeit she were not before, notwithstanding it was not impossible that she should haue beene, but that she holdeth the doctrine of Christ, is both false and impossible also. And as Luther sayth in defens. verb. Cœnæ tom. 7. fol. 385. *It is a mad mans part to proue vncertaine things by others as vncertaine.* And D. Whitaker cont. 2. quest. 3. cap. 3: *All proofe is by things that are more knowne.* Which also he hath cont. 2. quest. 5. cap. 18. Sadeel præfat. lib. cont. Traditiones. Daneus l. 4. de Eccles. cap. 2. D. Morton part. 2. Apol. lib. 1. cap. 37. Pareus lib. 3. de Iustificat. cap. 1. Wherupon Luther tom. 2. Præfat. assert. Antic. fol. 95. writeth *Aristotle and all sense of nature sheweth, that vnknowne things must be proued by things more knowne, and obscure things by manifest.* If therefore, (as Pareus sayth lib. 1. de Iustificat.

ficat. c. 20.) when the Aduerſarie is brought to that, that either he gaineſayth himſelfe, or beggs that which he is to proue, aſſuming that in his proofe which is in debate, or trifleth by repeating now and then the ſame thing, he is vanquiſhed; ſurely then Proteſtants are vanquiſhed, whom in this ſmal work we haue ſhewed oftentymes to gaineſay themſelues, now including theſe within the Church, now excluding them, now affirming the Church to be inuiſible, now denying it, now to haue alwayes Paſtours, now denying it, and the like: And in this argumment, with which alone they proue the exiſtēce of their Church before Luther, they aſſume in the Minor, that which moſt of all is in debate: And the Maior they can proue no otherwiſe, then by trifling by repeating it, and ſaying that it is out of all doubt. I add alſo, that the ſacramentaryes ſay, that the Lutheran Church erreth euen in the fundamentall points, and the like ſay the Lutherans of the Sacramentaries, and ſcarce there is any Proteſtant, who doth not thinke that the Church whereof he is doth erre in ſome points. What reaſon then haue they, out of the trueneſſe of the doctrin of their Churches to inferre their perpetuall exiſtence?

Caluin. 4. Inſtitut. c. 1. §. 12. Narrat. de Eccleſ. Belg. p. 196.

8. Thirdly I adde, that the manner wherwith Proteſtants doe proue the Minor of their foreſayd ſyllogiſme, is ſophiſticall and not ſuch as they exact of vs for proofe of our doctrine. For commonly they exact of vs to ſhew, that our doctrine is contained in expreſſe words in Scripture, or (as Luther ſayth lib. de ſeru. arbit. tom. 2. fol. 440) *inſo manifeſt teſtimonies as are able ſo to ſtop all mēs mouths as they are not able to ſay any thing againſt it*. But manifeſt it is, that ſuch be not the proofes wher with Proteſtants proue their doctrine.

For to omit other points, where is in expresse words in scripture that fundamentall point of their doctrin that we are iustified by only faith? Nay the contrary is so expresly in S. Iames epistle, as therfore Luther blasphemously sayth *S. Iames doted.* And the Lutherans for that very cause deny his epistle to be canonicall. Besides, Protestants doe now confesse, that the scripture is not of it selfe sufficient to end all questions of faith, and that Schismatikes cannot be convinced by scripture. How then can they sufficiently proue al the points of their doctrine by scripture? Againe, themselues acknowledge, that they need certaine meanes to attaine to the right sense of the Scripture and that their meanes are humane and not infallible, as knowledge of tongues, conference of places, and such like, and with all, that such as the meanes be, such is the exposition of Scripture. If therfore their meanes be not infallible, how can their vnderstanding of the scripture be infallible? Moreouer, they scarce euer proue any thing by both principles out of scripture, but almost euermore adioyne one human principles, as easily will appeare if their proofs be brought to a syllogisticall forme, as well obserue the most learned Bishop of Luçon in his defence of the Principall articles of faith cap. 3. & 5. And how can they be infallibly certaine of the conclusion, which they cannot know but by one human principle, whereof they can haue no such certainty? Furthermore, because many of their proofes doe not only consist of one humane principle, which is not at al in the scripture, but also they inferre a conclusiō directly contradictory to that which the scripture in most expresse words teacheth of that matter. As for example, when they proue that the Euchatist is

Tom. 8. in c. 12. Gen.

VVhitak cont. 1. q. 4. cap. 3.

VVhitak. loc. cit. p. 490.

Plessyl. de Eccles. c. 9.

Protestats conclude against sense.

of

not the very body and bloud of Chriſt, alwayes one of their principles is humane; and beſides their concluſiō is flat contrary to expreſſe words of ſcripture, which affirmeth that it is Chriſts very body and bloud. And who is he in his wittes, that will perſwade himſelfe, either that the ſcripture meaneth, that the Euchariſt is not the body & bloud of Chriſt, which directly it neuer ſayth, rather, then that it is his body and bloud, which it as expreſly ſayth, as euer it ſayth any thing, or that that proofe is not ſophiſticall, which out of one humane principle at leaſt, inferreth the contrary of that, which the ſcripture moſt expreſly teacheth? Laſtly, they neuer proued any one point of their doctrine any otherwiſe, then euer Heretiks do, that is in their own iudgmēt neuer before any iudge or general Councell, which Luther himſelfe conteſſeth in c. 27. Gen. tom. 6. fol. 368. in the words: *In the affaire of the Goſpell we haue decided the matter againſt al the impiety of the Pope without forme of law. VVe accuſed not the Pope, neither could we, for there was no iudge.* Yea their doctrin hath bin cōdemned according to all forme of law in the Generall Councel of Trent & of the Patriarch of Conſtantinople, to whō they appealed, and of al other kinds of Chriſtians.

9. Fourthly I ſay, that the foreſayd argument is a ſophiſme, in that in a ſēſible matter (as the Church is) it concludeth againſt the ſenſe of all men. For neither did any ſect be proteſtant Church before Luther, neither did any mā feele or perceiue himſelfe to haue bin a member of ſuch a Church before that time. Wherfore, as he ſhould manifeſtly play the Sophiſter who would goe about to proue by ſcripture that the ſunne appeareth at midnight: ſo likewiſe doth he, who out of ſcripture endeuoreth to proue, that there

was

was a protestant Church before Luther, because all mens sense conuince the one as well as the other. Besides protestants write, that though faith commaund vs to beleiue things which we see not, yet it doth not commaund vs, not to beleiue that which we see, for otherwise faith should be contrary to sense, and none should become faithfull, but he should first be senseless. But surely wonderfull is the blindnes or wilfulnesse of Sacramentaries, who in the matter of the Eucharist, against the most expresse words of Scripture, will endeuour to proue by sense, that there is not the body of Christ, when as the body of Christ there is not sensible. And here in the matter of existence of their Church before Luther, out of some apparent shew of scripture, against the most manifest sense of all men, will proue, that it was before Luthers time. When as a Church is a sensible thing, and can be felt either of others, or at least of them who are of it. How much better and more reasonably should they proceed, if in the Eucharist where Christs body is not sensible, they would rather giue eare to the most expresse words of scripture then to the suspicions of their seses, which can iudge of nothing but of sensible accidents; and in the matter of the Church, whose being is sesible, they would submit their vncertaine (if not false) expositions of scripture, not only to the sense of all men, but also the most certaine expositions of the Church and Fathers. But this sheweth, that in their beleife they are guided neither by sese nor scripture but out of them both borrow a shew of proofe for that which of their mere wilfulnes or fancy they choose to beleiue.

10. Thus thou seest (Christian Reader) for how vaine a sophisme, whose Maior is manifestly false &c

so

so false, as that out of this matter it is generally denyed of Protestants themselues, and so improbable also, as that it cannot be proued in no shew or colour, and whose Minor is more doubtfull, then the conclusiõ it selfe, and the manner of prouing sophisticall, and no other then the proofes of al Heretikes be: for how vaine a sophisme (I say) then the which scarce any can be more vaine, Protestants beleiue, or rather will seeme to beleiue, a thing wholy incredible, and in a thing sensible, against the sense of al mãkind, to wit, that before Luther there was a Church which held the whose substance or all the substantiall and fundamentall points of Protestancy; nor in so weighty a matter respect either their owne consciences, or the iudgements of men, or tribunal of God, or danger of their eternall damnation. Surely, that I may end with S. Basils words, *I moane and bewayle them that for a meane sophisme and counterfait paralogisme they cast themselues into hel.* *Homil. cont. Sabel.*

11. Out of all which hath bin sayd in this chapter, I thus frame my tenth and last demonstration: *If no sufficent testimonie, nor any probable argument, but only one fond sophisme, can be brought to proue that the Protestant Church was before Luther, this is not to be beleiued of any wise and prudent man: But no other proofe can be brought. Therfore &c.* And if it were not before Luther, surely he is the Author of it. The Maior is euident by it selfe, and the minor by what hath bin brought in this chapter. Certainely if euery one of the demõstrations which we haue brought, doe not conuince that the Protestant Church and religion was not before Luther, at least all of them together manifestly conuince it. For by the first fiue demonstrations was shewed that before Luther it was not at all, it was in no place,

was

was vnknowne of all the world, was not seene of any, nor had any Pastors: And with the rest hath bin demonstrated, that after Luther arose no ancienter Protestant did euer appeare and adioyne himselfe to Luther, that all the first knowne Protestants had bin Papists afore times, that the Protestant company and religion is new, that Luther and other plainly confesse, that he was autho of that religion, and finally that no proofe besides one friuolous fallacie can be brought to shew, that such a Church or religion had bin in former times. And if yet any protestant doubt hereof, let him at least compare al the foresayd demõstrations, wherwith so many wayes out of the very testimonies of Protestants we haue shewed, that no such Church was before Luther, with their vaine sophisme, wherewith they make shew to proue the contrary, and he will easily perceiue on whose side this so important truth is like to stand. And if he make any account of truth, of Gods seruice, of his owne reputation, or eternall saluation he will forsake the Protestants Church, & put himselfe in the lappe of the Catholike Church. Which (as S. Augustine speaketh) euen in the testimony of all mankind hath not only beene in all ages since Christ, but also hath had Pastors, nor hath been visible only to her owne, but to others also, and to the whole world, and hath most valiantly fought, ouercome, and triumphed ouer Iewes, Pagans, Heretikes, Schismatiks, and all the gates of hell. To preferre before this most ancient, most glorious church, another newly start vp, many ages lurking, knowne to none not to her owne, and destitute of Pastours, flocke, seat, and appearance, and in truth feigned, and deuised, and (to omit all other proofes) wounded

De vtil. credendi cap. 17.

ded deadly with so many confessions of her owne champions, and proued by one only vaine fallacie; what other thing were it, then to preferre lyes before truth, darckneſſe before light, death before life, the ſynagogue of Satan before the Church of Christ, and finally wilfully to caſt himſelfe headlong into hell?

What he must obſerue who will answere the foreſayd demonſtration.

CHAP. XVI.

SEEING I haue yielded ſo much to Proteſtants, & condeſcended to ſo vnequall conditions, as that I haue vndertaken to proue that Luther was the author of their Church and religion by the only Confeſſions of Luther and other Proteſtants, it is reaſon, that if any one of them goe about to answeare my foreſayd demõſtrations, he ſhould obſerue theſe moſt iuſt lawes, which I will here ſet downe, and which themſelues haue preſcribed to others.

2. Firſt therfore touching the words of Proteſtants which I haue alleadged, let him either confeſſe that they are truely cited by me, or if he denye that, let him not ſay it only, but let him ſhew, that they are ſuppoſed, falſifyed, or ſo changed, as that the ſenſe which I alledge and vrge to my purpoſe, be either quite altered, or elſe obſcured. For if in any place for breuities ſake the words be ſo litle chãged, as the ſenſe which I preſſe, remayne whole and clear, it skilleth not. Becauſe I argue not out of the meere titles or letters, but only out of their ſenſe and ſignifi-

See Vial. defenſ. de pol. part. 2. c. d. 5. Kemnice Exam. tit. de ſcript. Epiſt. Monit. p. 143. Calu. cont. Seruet. Pa. 643.

signification. Besides, if at any tyme there be some colour of cauiling about the alteratiō of the sense of one or other place (for iust cause I hope there will not be, though in so many places as are here cited it were no meruaile if some were mistakē) let him not therfore cry, that all the testimonies are falsified, or think that therby he hath satisfied all the rest.

3. Secondly touching the testimonyes themselues, let him obserue, that either he answere them all, or at least those, which are the stronger, as for the most part those are, which are noted in the margent, otherwise by the iudgment of the Fathers and Protestants also, he will shew in effect, that though he could not hold his peace, yet could he not answere sufficiently. For as S. Augustine (a) sayth: *Surely that he held his peace, not his tongue, but his cause failed him.* And in another place (b): *I take your silence for consent.* S. (c) Hierome: *You confesse more by silence then you denie by dispute.* And againe (d): *It skilleth litle, whether I binde mine aduersary sleeping or waking, only it is easier to binde one that is quiet, then one that resisteth.* (e) Luther also: *Euill consciences speake much besides the matter, but litle to the purpose, and seldome come to it.* And he noteth that it is the art and nimblenes of Heretikes, to skip ouer the matter and difficulty. Whitaker pronounceth it *to be a signe of a most desperate cause not to touch the Matter.* And D (f) Billon: *To this thou answearest nothing, and therfore all wise men conclude that thou canst not maintaine that which I then did disproue.* D, Sutliue lib. 2 de Eccles. cap. 1: *The rest because they say nothing to it, I will take for graunted. For if there had bin any hope of refuting it, or any place of calumniating without doubt they would not haue bin silent.* And M. (g) Burhill: *Amongst the wiser both of our side and yours a tergiuersation doth no lesse hurt his cause then a bewrayer. For he*

(a) Lib. 1. cont. Gaudent.
(b) Lib. 2. cont. Maxim.
(c) Epi. 61.
(d) Epi. 83.
(e) Tom. 7. fol. 384. 388.
(f) Defens. of serm. p. 243.
(g) Pro Tortura fors. c. 1.

he seemeth to consent & grant, who then holdeth his peace when silence is suspicion.

4. Thirdly touching the exposition of the testimonies, let him observe, that when the words are cleare and their sense manifest, he doe not expound them or wrest them to another meaning. For first, if cleare words must be expounded, there would be no end of expounding. Againe, to what purpose should he expound those words which need no exposition? This were, as (h) S. Augustin sayth, *no other then to goe about to bring darknesse into open light.* Besides, Protestants themselues say, that cleare words ought not to be expounded. For thus (i) Luther: *This rule (that one place is to be expounded by another) without doubt is particuler, to wit a doubtfull or obscure place must be expounded by another that is certaine and cleare. For to expound certaine and cleare places by conference of other places is wickedly to mock truth, and to bring cloudy into light.* The Ministers of Saxony in (k) Colloq. Aldeburg. say to their fellowes: *Let them remember that exposition is not to be admitted in cleare places.* And those of (l) Zurich: *Then there is need of declaration, when the words & sense thereof is obscure.* And Melancthon: *Nothing can be sayd so properly, so plainly, stedfastly, which may not be depraued by some cauillation.* Beza (m) also: *It is easy to wrest other mens writings.* And M. Dominis: (n) *Let those words which are cleare be kept in their proper and plaine sense.*

(h) Serm. 14. de verb. Apost.

(i) Luther. 10. 1. ep. ad Carolost.

(k) Pa. 308.

(l) Hospin. fol. 202.

(m) Ep. 40

(n) l. 2. c. 30

4. Fourthly let him observe, that in expounding the Protestants testimonies he deuise not hyperboles or figures at his pleasure, but let him bring good reason why he expoundeth them figuratiuely. *Either deny* (sayth (o) Tertullian) *that these are written, or proue that they ought to be taken as they are written.* And the Protestants in Admonit. de lib. Concord. cap. 3. say: *If they would not that those should be*

(o) Cont. Prax. 2.

vnderstood as they sound, why speake they so? And Brentius in Recognit. pag. 148. *What liberty, what temerity is this of abusing words and deuising a new Grammar?* For first the rule of vnderstanding mens words is, that they be taken according to their proper and common signification, vnlesse the writer or speaker do by some way declare the contrary. Whereupon (p) Luther sayth: *We haue ouercome, that words are to be taken in their natural sense except the contrary be demonstrated.* And (q) D. Rainolds: *That is the sense of words, in which they are commonly taken.* Besides, otherwise all force of proouing any thing by any words of God or man is quite gone. For sith all the force of such proofes standeth in the sense, if this be vncertaine, and must be proper or figuratiue according as the hearers or readers will; all the force of the proofes shall depend vpon the will of the hearer or Reader. And hence it proceedeth, that the proofes which Catholikes make out of Scripture against Heretikes seeme so some not to conuince the, which falleth out, not for defect in the proofes themselues, but for the manner of the, to wit because they be taken from words, which Heretiks will expound at their pleasure. And if there be no rule obserued in expounding words, but they be wrested at euery ones fancy, what meanes there, if Heretikes cannot be conuinced either by the words of Scripture or any other whatsoeuer. Moreouer, if at the will of the Reader or hearer words may be expounded either properly or figuratiuely, he that telleth the greatest vntruths, may be thought to tel the greatest truths, & contrariwyse, he that speaketh most piously, may be iudged to speake most impiously. Herevpon sayd (t) Luther: *If this licence raigne, I may interpret all things fully, whatsoeuer either Heretike or the diuell himselfe hath done or sayd.*

(p) *Tom. 2. fol. 473.*

(q) *Colloq. c. 8. Diu. 4.*

Note.

(t) *Tom. 5. fol. 489.*

ſayd, or can do to ſay ſo ouer. VVho euer shall be the meanes to reſtore vs heretikes the liberty? And (t) againe: *If it be vnſafe to play with figures at pleasure without yelding any reason, what hindereth but that all words haue now ſenſes?* Furthermore, it was the cuſtome of heretiks to deuiſe figures at their pleaſure. Thus (s) S. Athanaſius: *Heretiks rashly deuiſe figures.* And (u) Tertullian: *Theſe are the ſubtilties & ſleights of Heretiks to call in queſtion the ſimplicity of common wordes.* And this namely he noteth of the (x) Valentinians, as (y) S. Auſtin doth of the Priſcillianiſts. And the ſame condemneth Luther in the Sacramentaries, and the Sacramentaries in the Anabaptiſts. Finally Proteſtants themſelues condemne this wreſting of wordes from their proper ſignification without iuſt cauſe. Luther li. cont. Ecchium tom. 1. fol. 354: *I ſwonde deſerue thee as another Mercury at thy pleaſure.* And fol. 455: *To ſay that Auguſtin ſpeaketh exceſſiuely againſt Heretiks, is to ſay, that Auguſtin almoſt euery where lyed.* And Præfat. in Artic. Smalcald. he bitterly inueigheth againſt ſome who expounded his words againſt his meaning. The Miniſters of Saxony in Colloq. Aldeburg pag. 343. greatly complaine of the Electorall Miniſters, that they miſerably crucify Luther with their gloſſes, and pag. 337. ſay: *It is vnciuill to feigne a ſenſe, which the wordes beare not.* And pag. 304: *VVhoſoeuer goeth about to cloak opinions which by themſelues as the words ſound are falſe, he is guilty of them, eſpecially if he be a Doctour of the Church and Miniſter of the word of God.* And in like ſort the Miniſters of the Elector ſay to hole of Saxony pag. 252. that they *auoyd Luthers words by ſophiſticall interpretation, and by oppoſing other places.* And pag. 447: *Let power be giuen to expound & wreſt Luthers writings according to pleaſure and fancy, like the Sybills oracles or Sphinx his riddles.* Beſoldus alſo Præfat. in Comment. Luther in Geneſ. tom. 6. fol. 497. thus writeth

(t) Ib fol. 220.

(s) Epiſt. ad Serap.

(u) Cont. Hermog. c. 27.

(x) Præſc.

(y) l. de Hæreſ.

of some: *If they fall vpon any such places in Luthers interpretations by the clearnesse of which they may be refuted, they feigne that they are figuratively spoken, they deuise tropes and figures.* And whē the Sacramentaries expounded the words of the Confession of Ausburge commodiously and dextrously, as they speake, according to their opinion, the Lutherans sayd: *May not any in this manner subscribe to the Turkish Alcaron, and make the canons of Trent or other sentences howsoeuer contrary, to be orthodox all?* M. Bancroft thus writeth of Puritans: *You must bring strang discords of which these men will not make some harmony.* Against: *To their profit they can make Quodlibet ex Quolibet.* Pareus lib. 2. de Iustificat. cap. 13. sayth that it *riseth of a naughty cause to deprane the nature of words.* And lib. 4. cap. 1. calleth it a haynous slaunder in Bellarmine, when he sayd that many protestants speak one thing & meane another. The Ministers also of Zurich in Hosp. part. 2. fol. 161. affirme, *That he may iustly be condemned of madnesse of all who giueth credit not to sound and cleare words but to some explication not of him whose the words are but of some other whose they are not.* Yee lee how mad they are to be accounted, who should belieue not the plaine and euident testimonies of Protestants rehearsed of vs, but some other mans exposition of them. To which I add, that Luther and other Protestants do command, that according to the ciuill law, words be expounded against him, who could speake more clearly, and did not. Seing therefore Protestants could haue vttered their meaning more clearly, if they had meant otherwise then in the forsayd testimonies their words do signify, iustly we may interprete their wordes against them. Lastly Luther according to his own & other mens verdicts did vtter his mind plainly, and did condemne all doubtfull manner of speach in matter

Lobechius Disput. 2. Survey. ca. 27.

Luther to. 2. Colloq. Aldeb. fol. 303. Schuff. to. 4. Catal.

matters of religion. For thus writeth D. Whitaker of him: *He was an open and plaine man.* D. White: *They speake not alwayes so plainly as Luther doth.* And Luther himselfe: *I will be plaine.* Againe: *I had never the dissimulation to pretend to dispute that which I meant to determine.* And in another place: *I will not abide to be suspected of such hypocrisy, to think otherwise then I write.* And yet more: *To what is this double-tongued and hatefull kynd of speach, but vnder words and letters to sow the seed of all heresies?* The Confession of Saxony cap. 3: *In the Church we must auoyd ambiguities.* And Caluin de vera Eccl. reform. pag. 335: *When in all matters plainesse is to be vsed especially when religion is handled it is not lawfull to vse craft and dissimulations.* And the Sacramentaries in Admonit. de lib. Concordiæ cap. 3. pag. 62: *We endeuour nothing lesse then to seeme to be of one opinion with them with whome we are not.* To conclude howsoeuer it may be, that one or other Protestant, in some one kind of writing, had written hyperbolically or figuratiuely when he declared it not; yet that so many, and so principall Protestants, so often, and in so many kind of writings as we haue cited, & in a matter of so great moment, should speake hyperbolically or figuratiuely, and yet not declare that they meant so, is altogeather incredible. Wherefore vnlesse Protestants will ouerthrow the very rule of vnderstanding mens speaches or words, and make the fancy of the hearer or reader the rule of vnderstanding them, take away all force of proofes out of any words whatsoeuer, imitate both old and new heretikes, follow that manner of expounding words which themselues haue condemned, expound Luther contrary to his owne protestation, and confesse that Protestants in so great a matter speak one thing and thought another, and finally affirme a thing so incredible, as euen now

Præfat. ad Demonstr. Sanderi. Def. c. 33. Tom. 2 fol. 214. 215. Epist. ad Amsdorf.

Note.

now we shewed this to be, they cannot interprete the foresayd testimonies of Protestants hyperbolically or figuratively, vnlesse they yield a sufficient reason or proofe thereof. Besides, if in this question of fact they not only reiect the testimonies of Catholikes and of all other men besides their owne, but also expound their owne mens testimonies as they list, they manifestly shew, that in this matter they will heare no testimony nor abide any iudgement whatsoeuer, which is the most euident argument that can be of a naughty cause. For to admit testimonies, not according to the proper sense of the wordes, but to your owne liking, is only to admit the sound or figures of the words, and to reiect the sense or signification, which is the soule and forme of them, and in which alone the force of the testimony or iudgement doth consist.

6. Fiftly touching the reason or argument wherewith he will proue, that Protestants in their testimonies by me alleadged meant hyperbolically or figuratively; let him not account it sufficient to shew, that the same Protestants in other places haue sayd the contrary. First, because this will not shew, that they sayd not that which in the places which I cite they most plainly and euidently did say, but only, that according to the manner of Heretikes and lyers they gainesayd themselues: May a man accused of crime expound figuratiuely his open Confession of that crime, because at other times he denyed it? Againe Protestants themselues reiect this kind of proofe. For (as we did see) the Ministers of the Prince Electour did reprehend those of the Duke of Saxony, because they auoyded Luthers testimonies by opposing other places of his. And the Ministers of

Saxony

Saxony pag. 203. say: *It is a fraudulent kind of argument; He said well sometymes, therefore here.* Besides, it will be as equall for me to inferre, that Protestants in those testimonies which he produceth, did speake figuratiuely, because in those which I alleage they manifestly sayd the contrary. For to vse Luthers wordes: *By thy rashnes and licence ye giue your aduersary leaue to turne it against you.* Certainly if they clearly haue layd both, we cannot deny, but they thought both, or els must confesse, that your pleasure shall be the rule and square to know what they speake properly & what figuratiuely. Moreouer, Protestants crie, that the holy Fathers contradicted themselues: *How often* (sayth Luther) *doe the Fathers fight with themselues? They are men that fight against themselues. We find the Fathers to haue taught contraryes, to haue stumbred.* And Caluin: *The Fathers doe often skirmish amongst themselues, and sometymes fight with themselues.* The like sayth Melanethon tom. 1. Luther. fol. 341. Iacobus Andreæ cont. Prolum pag. 282. Beza Præfat. in nouum Testamentum and in Schusselburg lib. 4. Theol. Calum. art. 32. Pareus lib. 2 de Grat. & lib. arbit. cap. 14 & lib. 4. cap. 4. Polanus part. 1. Theol. de Notis Eccles. Apologia Anglica. And D. Whitaker lib. 3. cont. Durum. Wherefore, either they must shew some priuiledge whereby Protestants be more exempted from contradicting themselues, then the holy Fathers in their opinion were, or they must not inferre, that they sayd not that which they did in place by me alleged, because otherwhere they sayd the contrary. Further more, because both the Fathers and Protestants (as I shewed in the Preface) doe teach, that Heretikes are wont to contradict themselues. And the Sectaries both say and shew by many examples, that

By Tom. 2. fol. 222.

Tom. 2. Assert. Art. 2. & cont. Cochleum. Præfat. Institut.

Hosp. to. 2. fo. 11 Beza in Colloquil. Zuing to. 2. fol. 412. 458. 460.

Luther oftentymes hath gainsayd himselfe. And of Sacramentaries Schusselburg lib. 1. Theol. Calvin art. 29. writeth: *That it is their property to contradict themselues.*

7. Lastly, touching the weight of the Protestant Confessions which we produce, let him not think, that it is any way impaired in that they haue at other tymes sayd the contrary, as if in this matter they were not to be beleeued, because they haue byn taken in two tales. For the Confessions of those that are accused be of greatest force against themselues, because (as I sayd) no man willingly lyeth against himselfe, neither can these be discredited by any words of theirs spoken in their owne behalfe. For what will it anayle a criminall person, if he deny an hundred tymes the cryme, which he once openly confessed. And Protestants haue not once, but oftentyms, most plainly, most openly, most freely confessed those things which I allcage. Againe, though no credit be to be giuen to a lyer who gainsayth himself in matters for his owne behalfe or against any others, neuertheleſſe in a matter against himselfe, the greatest yea euen the diuels open & free Confession ought more to be credited then any other mans testimony whatsoeuer. Wherfore we allcage Protestants sayings not as testimonies, but as Confessions, neither produce them as witnesses, but as Criminels confessing the truth against themselues. And as Saint Ambrose sayd; *I admit not the diuels testimony but his Confession*; so I accept not the Protestants testimonies, but their confessions. Let their testimony be of no credit, either for themselues, or for others, or against others, vndoubtedly it is of great force against themselues. As the Latin Orator sayd: *Thy testimony which in another*

Serm. 3. de Sanctis.

mans matter would be light, is in thine owne matter, because it is against thy selfe, most weighty. Besides Protestants crie, that it is found to produce the Criminels as witnesses in their owne cause, and that any witnesse in his owne cause is to be reiected. Whereupon in the question of Supremacy they refuse the testimonies of all Popes though neuer so ancient, neuer so learned, neuer so holy. How much better may we reiect the testimonies of Protestants, when they speak in behalfe of their religion, and yet admit their Confessions, when they speake against it. These therfore lawes of answearing so iust, so equall, and approued of the Protestants themselues, if he will not keep, who goeth about to answeare my foresayd arguments, it will easily appeare, that in very deed he could not answeare them, And if none endeauour to answeare them, it will yet more appeare, that they can no way answeare them, & that this kind of dealing with Protestants out of their owne Confessions, is the fittest of all to stop their mouthes.

Vorstium Antibel. pag. 440. 430. Iuel. Def. part. 2. c. 2. D. Fulk. Whitak. cont. 4. q. 2. c. 2. & q. 4. c. 2.

FINIS.

The Translatour vnto the Reader.

THE Author adioyned hereto a Catalogue of the Protestant Books with their seuerall impressions, out of which he gathered the testimonies by him alleaged: but because I thought it not needfull for those that vnderstande his English copy, I haue omitted it. The Reader if he please, may see it in the Authors Latin Copy.

27 Ap 38

THE

THE INDEX OR TABLE OF THE CHAPTERS CONTAYNED IN THESE BOOKES.

The first booke of the essence or substance of the Protestant Church and Religion.

CHAPTER 1. *That sometymes Protestants admit very few into the Church, and require very many thinges to the making of a member thereof.*

Chap. 2. *That at sometymes Protestants account Papists to be of the Church.*

Chap. 3. *That sometymes Protestants acknowledge all that deny either fundamentall or other articles of*

of fayth Heretikes, Schismatikes, and their professed enemies to be members of their Church.

Chap. 4. *That sometymes they do graunt Idolaters, Infidels, Atheists, and Antichrist himselfe to be members of their Church.*

Chap. 5. *That Protestants sometymes account all their brethren, who vnder the name of Christians, oppose themselues against the Pope.*

Chap. 6. *That it is necessarily required to a Protestant, that he beliene Iustification by only speciall fayth.*

Chap. 7. *That it is also necessary to a Protestant, to beliene all the fundamentall points of Protestancy.*

Chap. 8. *Which are the fundamentall points of Protestancy, and what a Protestant is.*

THE SECOND BOOKE.

Of the Author or beginner of the Protestant Church and Religion.

Chap. 1. *THat Protestants confesse, that their Church and Religion was substantially perished when Luther began.*

Chap. 2. *The shiftes, wherewith Protestants would delude*

delude their confeſſions of the ſubſtantiall deſtruction of their Church and Religion, refuted.

Chap. 3. That Proteſtants confeſſe, that all and euery one followed a different Church and Religion from theirs, before Luther began to preach.

Chap. 4. That Proteſtants graunt, that their church and Religion was quite inuiſible before Luther appeared.

Chap. 5. Thoſe, which ſay there were any viſible Proteſtants before Luther, refelled.

Chap. 6. That the Church cannot be ſo inuiſible, as Proteſtants confeſſe theirs to haue byn before Luther tymes.

Chap. 7. That Proteſtants acknowledge, that there were no Proteſtant Paſtors before Luther.

Chap. 8. That the Church cannot be without Paſtors.

Chap 9. That the Proteſtant Church was no where before Luther aroſe.

Chap. 10. The Sophiſtries, wherewith ſome Proteſtants would ſeeme to proue that in tymes paſt the Proteſtants Church was in Popery, refuted.

Chap. 11. That all the firſt knowne Proteſtants, had byn Papiſts before tymes.

Chap. 12. That no auncienter Proteſtant then Luther, ſtept forth and adioyned himſelfe to Luthers company, when he preached ſecurely.

Chap. 13. That the Proteſtant Church & Religion is new.

Chap. 14. *That Protestants doe in plaine termes confesse, that Luther was the Author and beginner of their Church and Religion.*

Chap. 15. *That Protestants cannot proue by any sufficient witnes, or any probable argument, that their Church was before Luther.*

Chap. 16. *What he must obserue, who will vndertake to answeare this Worke.*

27 AP 58

FINIS.